DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 258 010 CE 041 677

AUTHOR	Elmore, Richard F.; Narver, Betty Jane
TITLE	Youth Employment Delivery Systems: Case Studies of Three Settings.
INSTITUTION	Washington Univ., Seattle. Inst. for Public Policy and Management.
SPONS AGENCY	National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	[83]
GRANT	NIE-G-80-0138
NOTE	140p.; For related documents, see CE 041 676-680.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Career Education; Case Studies; *Delivery Systems; *Disadvantaged Youth; *Employment Programs; Federal Aid; *Federal Programs; High Risk Persons; High Schools; Out of School Youth; Postsecondary Education; Secondary Education; *Youth Employment; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS	California (San Francisco); Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Washington (Clark County); Washington (King County); Washington (Seattle)

ABSTRACT

Three case studies are offered of the delivery structure for employment programs dealing with "high-risk" youth in three settings. These three, representing distinctive types of delivery systems prevalent in the implementation of federally funded employment programs, are (1) Seattle-King County, where the designated local recipient of Federal funds contracts with other units of local government to deliver services; (2) Clark County, Washington, where a county agency covering a rural-metropolitan area delivers services through its own agencies; and (3) San Francisco, where a unit of local government contracts primarily with nonprofit community agencies to deliver services. Data are from unstructured and structured interviews with employment administrators at the local level, front-line personnel in organizations delivering services, and young people. The case studies are presented in this format: (1) discussion of general characteristics of structure and operations, including the local-level agency with general responsibility for Federal employment policy, the organizations with delivery-level responsibility, the local political setting and labor market, and the structure of administrative relations between central administrators and service deliverers; (2) discussion of the nature of delivery-level work in service delivery organizations; and (3) discussion of young people's perceptions and experiences with school, work, and employment programs. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED258010

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT DELIVERY SYSTEMS:

CASE STUDIES OF THREE SETTINGS

Richard F. Elmore
Associate Professor
Graduate School of Public Affairs
University of Washington

Betty Jane Narver
Research Consultant
Institute for Public Policy and Management
University of Washington

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CE041677

These case studies were prepared as part of research project funded by the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Education, under Grant NIE-G-80-0138. The authors wish to acknowledge Janet Campbell, who provided invaluable research assistance on the project, and the people who gave their time to be interviewed.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT DELIVERY SYSTEMS:

CASE STUDIES OF THREE SETTINGS

During the school year 1981-82, we conducted a series of case studies of the delivery structure for employment programs dealing with "high-risk" youth in three settings: Seattle, Washington (including the surrounding King County), Clark County, Washington and San Francisco, California. These three settings were chosen because they represented three distinctive types of delivery systems that are prevalent in the implementation of federally-funded employment programs in the United States. The first model, typified by Seattle-King County, is one in which the designated recipient of federal funds at the local level-- a local government agency called the "prime sponsor" under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA)-- contracts with other units of local government to deliver employment services. In Seattle-King County, the major deliverers of youth employment programs were the Seattle Public School System, the City's Department of Human Resources, and the County's Division of Human Services. The second model, typified by Clark County, is one in which a county agency covering a rural-metropolitan area delivers employment services through its own agencies. This might be called the "county unit" system. This is a mode of delivery that is commonly used in predominantly rural parts of the country where county government is strong, especially in the South. Prior to the commencement of our research, the Clark County government directly administered most of the federally-funded employment and training activities within its borders. However, during the period of our interviewing, Clark County was in the process of devolving its operations of employment programs entirely to other units of government, mainly school systems and the community college system. The actual delivery

system that we observed was partly like the Seattle-King County system, in that it involved contracting arrangements with other units of local government, and partly like the county unit system, in that it still involved strong influence of county government. The third model, typified by San Francisco, is one in which a unit of local government contracts primarily with non-profit community organizations to deliver services, rather than with other government agencies. In San Francisco, these community organizations were primarily ethnically- and neighborhood-based, and had no affiliation with large national organizations like the Urban League or the Opportunities Industrialization Centers. This model is characteristic of many large cities with strong ethnic divisions.

Our studies of youth employment delivery systems in these localities were designed to construct, from the ground up, a view of how services related to young peoples' participation in the labor force are actually delivered. We concentrated on programs for "high-risk" youth-- defined as low-income youth predominantly from ethnic and linguistic minorities-- because these programs are the primary focus of federal policy and because they raise the most difficult problems for young peoples' participation in the labor force.

The data for our local case studies came from three sources. The first source was unstructured interviews with employment administrators at the local level, designed to gather basic background information about the setting and the operations of the youth employment system. The second was structured interviews with front-line personnel in organizations that deliver youth employment services. Our definition of a "front-line" or "delivery-level" worker was any adult whose responsibility involves dealing directly with young people, rather than supervising the work of others. These interviews were designed to capture delivery-level workers' knowledge and understanding of (1) the purposes of their work; (2) the main activities they performed in doing

their jobs; (3) the problems that young people presented to them; and (4) how their work was structured by the organizations in which they worked and the policies under which their programs were sponsored. The third source of data was structured interviews with young people in the organizations where we interviewed adults. These interviews were designed to capture (1) young peoples' experiences with the school system, and with vocational education in the school system; (2) their labor market experience; (3) how they had negotiated entry to the labor force, if they had; and (4) their attitudes toward school and work. The instruments used for interviews with delivery-level personnel and young people are included as an appendix to these case studies.

The period during which we interviewed was one of tremendous upheaval in the delivery systems we studied. Federal funding had been substantially reduced in all the systems we studied in the year prior to interviews, and all the systems were preparing for further, more dramatic, reductions in the following year. In one system-- Seattle-- there was an unanticipated influx of Asian refugees at the beginning of the school year that changed the composition of the client population from previous years. In another system-- San Francisco-- some organizations experienced a substantial decline in demand for their services, despite an increasing unemployment rate, for which they could provide no ready explanation. Ultimately, after our interviewing was completed, the federal government changed the basic structure of the employment delivery system by removing the authority of local governments to administer federal policy (prime sponsors), and replacing that system with one based on joint councils of employers and local government officials. At this writing, that system is still in its early stages of implementation.

The data in these case studies, then, have limited value in generalizing to other localities or to how programs will work under the new federal structure. The studies are still useful, however, in helping to expose and understand how the process of helping high-risk youth enter the labor force actually works, who does it, what those people do, how their organizations work, and how young people perceive the process. These issues are of perennial interest to federal policymakers and others with an interest in youth employment policy.

The case studies are presented in the following format. First, we discuss general characteristics of structure and operations for each setting, including the agency with general responsibility for federal employment policy at the local level, the organizations with delivery-level responsibility, the local political setting and labor market, and the structure of administration relations between central administrators and service deliverers. Second, we discuss the nature of delivery-level work in service delivery organizations, based on our interviews with front-line workers. And third, we discuss young peoples' perceptions and experiences with school, work, and employment programs.

Seattle

Young people prepare themselves for employment in Seattle within a broad and unconnected system. Some information is available on those moving through the formal, articulated part of that system, but many prepare for and find jobs through a variety of informal, unreported connections. Another large and basically undocumented segment is formed by the activities of private employers. About one-third of the employers in King and Snohomish Counties provide organized training programs for new employees, many of them young people working for the first time.[1] In the past, government youth policy has had little direct relationship with the business community or with private proprietary institutions. This may change, however, as the federal legislation replacing CETA and programs sponsored by state and local governments attempt to develop a more articulated public/private structure for employment preparation.

The description in this section will focus on that portion of the publicly-funded system of employment programs that deal with so-called "high risk" young people. In Seattle these programs are administered by the public schools and by the City's Department of Human Resources. They are, respectively, the Work Training Program and the Out-of-School Program. We have included no information on the summer youth programs. We recognized that there were many young people enrolled in the CETA Title IIb programs operated by various community-based organizations in Seattle but chose to examine mainly programs directed explicitly at youth.

CETA funding in Seattle at the time of this study was administered by a prime sponsor consisting of Seattle, King County and Snohomish County. The King-Snohomish Manpower Consortium had been the largest geographic consortium in the country. The prime sponsor had an Advisory Council which was chaired by locally elected officials in Seattle, King and Snohomish Counties. Political problems erupted at regular intervals as the Consortium attempted to allocate

and administer CETA funds in the member jurisdictions. Snohomish County finally withdrew from the Consortium with considerable ill-will toward the prime sponsor and its administrators. Down to two jurisdictions and a new name -- the Employment and Training Consortium -- the prime sponsor had internal administrative problems that were exacerbated by political bickering on its Advisory Council between the mayor and county executive. Although some subcontracts were awarded to community-based organizations and to the Seattle School District, the primary contracts went to the City and to the County. Youth money was divided among the school district and the City (for the in-school and out-of-school programs) and the County.

Seattle Public Schools

The Seattle school district provides a variety of programs that are related to job preparation for young people. These programs are administered in a self-contained fashion. There is little contact between the various administrators at the central administration level and interaction at the delivery level happens primarily at the instigation of individual staff members.

- Career Education. This is a general program designed to provide students in K-12 with a variety of career-oriented experiences. There are specific classes such as decision-making, career choice, etc., taught primarily at the ninth grade level. Efforts have been made to infuse career exploration information and planning into the general K-12 curriculum. A major part of the program is the Comprehensive Guidance Program which places a career guidance counselor in each of the city's ten high schools. The counselor works in a career center providing career information, access to the Washington Occupational Information Service (a computerized information system that moves from school to school), workshops on job search skills, speakers and some matching between students and employers. The more aggressive counselors work in the community to develop jobs for young people. The success of the program depends heavily on the initiative of the individual counselor and the interest of a principal in supporting the program.

- Vocational Education. The district offers 22 occupational programs in its ten high schools and nine at the three campuses of Seattle Community College. About 29 percent of the district's 9-12 graders take vocational education classes compared with 54 percent average statewide. Among seniors, eight percent take vocational classes. Only about 10 percent of the district's total programming is considered vocational and it

spends about two percent of its school budget on vocational education.[2] Vocational class opportunities are only about one half the statewide average and vary tremendously according to the particular high school. Some principals, or strong vocational education teachers, have managed to maintain programs in some schools but because there is no open enrollment in the city's schools, student opportunities to take vocational courses in general or to take particular courses is dependent upon residence patterns.

According to a report prepared by the Office of the Mayor, 55 percent of the city's public school graduates go directly into the job market. At least two-thirds of these job-seniors have received no vocational education. Many have received no job search assistance or career counseling in general. The 55 percent looking for jobs does not include those students who have dropped out of the schools and may already be in the job market.

- Work Experience. This program was at one time an active, well-funded part of the school district's employment preparation effort. At present, however, there are only two high schools that have a work experience program, and those programs are dependent upon particular principals who have maintained a strong endorsement of this approach to job preparation.

- Work Training Program. This CETA-funded, school district-administered program has provided a WTP counselor in each of the district's ten high schools. These counselors are responsible for assessing the needs of CETA-eligible students, conducting job preparedness workshops, and job development in the private sector. Approximately 600 students were being served during the period of our interviewing. (This program is discussed at length in the next section of this paper.)

City of Seattle (Department of Human Resources)

The City of Seattle was given responsibility for operating the CETA-funded Out-of-School Program, in cooperation with the Seattle Public Schools.

- Out-of-School Program. This program has two components: a classroom segment staffed by Seattle school district teachers that help students get their GEDs. In addition, employment specialists hired by the city provide needs assessments, counseling, placement in subsidized jobs and monitoring of job performance. At exit from the program, these specialists help develop private sector jobs for the enrollees. The program is administered by the City'd Department of Human Resources, Youth Services Division. About 100 students are enrolled in the program yearly.

CHOICE (Community Helping Organizations in Career Education)

A number of organizations work with the Seattle district to provide expanded career exploration. In addition to standard programs such as Junior Achievement and special career-oriented programs, the major community/district effort is:

- PIPE (Private Initiatives in Public Education). This is a non-profit organization that pairs high schools with local businesses to give

students work opportunities. In addition, the partner businesses bring extra resources into the schools through the use of special volunteer programs. Seattle's Chamber of Commerce provides support for this effort.

OTHER

Vocational courses are offered in the Community College system, in the two vocational technical institutes, and in a number of proprietary training institutions.

Although we recognize that only approximately 700 students were served by the two CETA-funded programs operating under Title IV in 1980-81, we have focused our interviewing and our attention on the programs operated by the school district and by the City. We believe the information gathered from these programs will be more useful in looking at youth policy than by examining the programs operated by the community-based organizations under Title IIb. The district and the city programs have a centralized administrative structure and operate under similar guidelines as compared to the variety of CBO programs.

Work Training Program (WTP)

This part of the paper will be divided into several sections looking first at the Work Training Program itself. We will describe the way it was organized during the period of our interviewing, paying special attention to two major changes in the program and the programmatic impact of those changes.

The second section will look at the experience of delivery level staff and their perceptions of:

- characteristics and problems of the young people in the program
- functions and purposes of their own work
- contact they have with other adults working with young people
- organization within which they work
- relationship of policy, regulations and guidelines on their work and their clients.

A third section will report the responses of young people interviewed in regard to:

- experiences in school
- experiences with adults who have helped them
- experiences with work

- peer attitudes toward school and work
- approaches to job search and perceptions of access to jobs
- perception of their work future.

1. Structure and Organization of the Work Training Program

The Work Training Program in Seattle has gone through considerable change during the last few years. Until the 1979-80 school year, WTP counselors had all been located in the program's administrative offices, a closed public school. (Although a school district program, WTP has always been housed and operated as a distinct administrative unit.) Young people came to the counselors for orientation sessions usually as a result of contact with the CETA summer program or through word of mouth. Once a student had gone through orientation and had been checked for eligibility, he or she would be placed in a subsidezed, public sector job. The counselor's primary contact was through visiting clients at school and on the work sites, making reports on job performance. During the on-site visits (usually twice a month), the counselor would talk to the work supervisor for additional information about performance and attitude.

During the 1980-81 school year, the counselors were placed in each of Seattle's high schools. Counselors were usually located in the school's career center where a career counselor provided job preparation and information services for all students. Students still came to the WTP administrative offices for orientation sessions at the beginning of the school year. Central office staff handled intake procedures including eligibility checks, worked on job development, performed compliance monitoring, and provided special educational services. The growing need for bilingual services was recognized by hiring a bilingual specialist who developed programs for non- or limited-English speakers. During this school year, counselors spent more and more time in their schools although they still came down to the central office for student orientation and staff meetings. They continued to visit clients on the subsidized work sites.

During the summer of 1981, substantial cuts in CETA funding forced the Work

Training Program staff to reconsider the way in which the program's resources were being allocated. During that summer, staff worked together to devise a way of maintaining maximum services for young people while minimizing staff reductions. They decided to keep a counselor in each high school, make some central office cuts, and eliminate subsidized jobs. The rationale was that by keeping a full counseling staff, each high school unit could work with more students, provide more concentrated assistance in job preparation, and then work on job development in the private sector. Each counselor became responsible for developing jobs in the school's neighborhood, usually spending one half of each working day "on the street" generating job prospects. In addition, five central office staff worked in the downtown business community trying to develop jobs in that area.

At the time staff was trying to restructure the WT program, there was great uncertainty as to whether Title IV funds would be available for the next year. Agreement had been reached by the Seattle-King County Manpower Consortium that Title IIb funds would be made available from other programs to carry programs for young people. The success of IIb programs was closely linked to the private sector placement rate and the direction of the program that began in September 1981, reflected the thrust to place students in private sector jobs.

In addition to the school-based counseling programs, there were still 38 on-the-job training slots carried over until December 1981. A special program called Stay-in-School provided federal funding for federal agencies to hire low income students who maintained good grades. The Work Training Program had placed 50 young people in this program during the 1980-81 school year. However, slots did not have to be filled through WTP. Other high school counselors and Employment Security offices could place students. There appeared to be confusion about this program because WTP operated as an intake center for low income kids but hiring for the Stay-in-School slots did not require their involvement. Agencies were being contacted directly by high schools and did their own hiring with their own requirements. Some of the agencies would only hire American citizens which created

placement problems for schools with high Asian refugee populations.

In the year before the CETA cuts, the program had served a total of 850 students. Of these, 250 were special education kids. At that time a counselor in the WPT administrative office worked specifically with the special ed population. Other counselors in the schools had some special ed cases but the major effort was coordinated out of the central office. Special education work sites had been developed through the VOTIS program (Vocational Occupational Training in an Industrial Setting) but after the programmatic change of the 1980-81 school year, a number of the work sites were terminated because the jobs were no longer subsidized. The parents of special education students had been most upset by the change because of the increased problem of placing that group without subsidization. Despite pressure from the well-organized parent group,* special education students were assigned to regular case loads and treated as the rest of the clients in the program.

Another activity which had been carried on in the central administrative offices was a special bilingual tutoring program. Originally designed to provide English as a Second Language (ESL) for high school refugees, this ESEA funded three year grant was expanded into the Work Training Program because so many refugees were CETA-eligible. In addition, the regular WTP staff had had tremendous problems placing non-English speaking clients. They had found that non-English speaking students were not being given graduated work responsibilities as other clients were. In order to improve the situation, this program paired bilingual students with non-English speaking clients on the job. They also were hired as ESL tutors for one hour a day and helped the refugee clients with life-survival skills and job English. When the subsidized jobs were phased out, the coordinator of the ESEA grant was left without the job situations which could handle the paired bilingual and non-English speaking students. She was pessimistic about the possibiliti

*Special Education students need not meet the normal CETA income requirements so the parent group included all economic levels.

of developing jobs of this kind in the private sector.

In the year of interviewing, 1980-81, there had been major reductions in staff. Although the Work Training Program staff were all school district employees, funding for the program was separate and layoffs came as a result of CETA cuts rather than school district cuts. The core group of high school counselors remained. In addition there were five special job developers (including one liaison with organized labor), six clerical workers, and seven other staff responsible for supervision, intake, eligibility and compliance monitoring.

The second major change in program did not come as a conscious, planned decision of staff or as the result of funding reductions. It came instead with the wave of Asian refugees who were pouring into Washington State, innundating a number of social service programs, including the school district's Work Training Program. The population of the program had been changing over time, gradually at first, but by the time of our study, many high schools were finding their client groups totaling over 90 percent Asian (mostly refugee) enrollments. During the summer of 1980, CETA's summer youth program had been filled by Asians and when the Work Training Program started in September with a new open enrollment system, the lists were immediately filled by the refugee students. In what appeared to many as an unexpected, overnight phenomenon, the traditional WTP minority students (black) had been displaced by Asians, most of whom did not speak English, and who exhibited a whole new range of values, attitudes and experiences. In many high schools, counselors found themselves having to recruit blacks and whites in an effort to balance their client group and meet program guidelines.

The first wave of Indochinese refugees arrived in Seattle in 1975. Most were Vietnamese with a relatively high level of education and work experience. Successive waves, however, brought an increasing number of unaccompanied youth many of whom had never been to school and whose work experience had been limited

to agriculture in remote rural areas of Cambodia or among the Hmong tribespeople. The problems of the school district and its work training compenent were intensified not only by numbers but by the different needs of each successive wave of refugees.

Nearly all the refugees were on welfare and their need for money was severe. Often, young people wanted to earn money not only for survival but also in order to send it back to family members still in camps in Southeast Asia. The refugees generally were older (17-20) than other enrollees in the Work Training Program. Some had lied about their age at time of arrival so they could enter this country as unaccompanied minors and also so they could stay in the schools as long as possible. There is strong indication that the Asian young people look at the schools as a critical part of a support system -- for some the only one to which they have access aside from welfare. Even the welfare and medical assistance programs proved unreliable as Washington State's fiscal crisis caused termination of aid to refugees after 18 months rather than the expected three years. Within the refugee community as a whole, however, a highly developed system has been developed to help new arrivals gain access to all the services available to them.

These characteristics which we will discuss further, formed a very different client population than the traditional one in the Work Training Program. The major thrust of this population change came just as the decision was made to shift from subsidized jobs to the development of jobs in the private sector. It is difficult to disengage the effects of these two changes. However, the rush by Asian students to fill the open enrollment slots of WTP occurred as black students were finding there were no longer any subsidized jobs. Over time the black students had become conditioned to expect subsidized jobs would be available in the Work Training Office. If the student were eligible, he or she could come and ask for a job, or if not satisfied with a current one, could ask for a different

placement. There was little sense of urgency on the part of black students because they apparently assumed jobs would still be available upon request. Ironically, since most of the Asian students were receiving welfare, pay from unsubsidized jobs in the private sector decreased the amount of their grants.

In the section on policy, we will discuss further the implications of this dual change in program and population on the school district's CETA-funded program and on its staff and clients.

2. Delivery-Level Perceptions, Problems and Working Relations

In our interviews with the ten counselors who worked in high schools with young people, we learned that eight had been in the program over two years. All had previously been involved in some aspect of education including regular classroom teaching, special education, and tutoring children at home. A number had a background in counseling including several who had worked in the district's Child Development Program -- a specially-funded project for the early identification and treatment of behavior problems. All had worked directly with young people before and the concerns most frequently expressed centered on the kinds of problems students faced in trying to find and adjust to the realities of work. Most felt that the young people they saw didn't really understand what was expected of them in a job and in addition to lacking specific job search and work skills, many young people now lacked confidence in themselves. Despite the fact that the counselors were now being evaluated on the basis of placement rates, putting young people in jobs was not the overriding concern. Instead, counselors appeared far more interested in trying to bring their clients to a state of readiness in terms of job preparedness and confidence.

In the interviews with the high school counselors, it was often difficult to sort out responses about young people in general from specific comments concerning special problems of the Asian population. In discussing the refugees specifically, counselors remarked on a number of characteristics. Always the primary problem

was that of communication. The frustration of dealing with non- or limited-English speakers was obvious. In some schools, particularly those which had been designated as newcomer centers, there was some assistance by interpreters. But even in those schools, interpreters couldn't be present for every exchange so there were continuing problems. As mentioned earlier, many of the refugees were older and about half were classified as unaccompanied minors. Some of these lived with other families or with siblings but a surprising number either lived alone or with other young people. A number of counselors commented on the burden of grief so many of the young people carried over the loss or separation from family. There appeared to be signs of constant trauma and anxiety for many of the refugees.

Despite the language furstration, it was striking to note how many counselors felt good about their contact with the refugee young people. They spoke often about the fact that they felt they were helping these students and giving them an important source of support. Their efforts were visibly appreciated. The students came to see them often, were eager and responsive. Compared to the attitude of some of the other enrollees who assumed a subsidized job would be waiting for them, the refugee young person clearly was grateful not only for actual assistance but for the attention and concern expressed by the counselors.

Many of the counselors felt that the refugees were far more eager to work and more willing to do any kind of work than their non-refugee counterparts. Once hired, the Asian students were consistent in their attendance and made tremendous efforts to carry out tasks carefully as directed. While waiting for a job, these students would be likely to come by every day to ckeck potential listings. This willingness to wait patiently and persistently for job possibilities appeared to counselors to reflect the experiences they had been through in refugee camps where standing in a line could mean the difference between receiving food or not, or boarding a ship coming to the United States or not.

One of the questions we pursued with counselors was what they thought had happened to their traditional clients -- black students. Interestingly enough, a number of the adults had not specifically thought about the change in their population from that perspective. They obviously recognized the difference in working with the Asian students but most did not have a clear idea of what young black students were doing.

Two things seemed to explain the change: the eagerness of Asian students to get enrolled following participation in the summer program and filling the available slots; and as mentioned earlier, a somewhat more passive attitude on the part of black students who had become conditioned to the availability of subsidized jobs. When pressed, some counselors said they assumed the black kids were just getting jobs on their own through family and friends or not working at all. A number of adults also pointed to the stigma associated with being enrolled in the CETA-funded program. Many black students don't want to identify themselves as low income. In some cases, families that had been eligible have lost that eligibility but don't want a CETA-eligibility check because they fear termination from other programs. One counselor opined that black students could be enrolled in the special Community College vocational education program operated jointly with the district, or they might be concentrating on sports in the hope of getting scholarships. Another assumed the students had heard there were no subsidized jobs so didn't show up at the WTP office, they had found other jobs, didn't want to work or had given up. This same counselor in commenting that he didn't have many blacks or whites stopping by to ask questions about the program, believed than many students see the Work Training Program as a special program for Asian refugees.

Generally speaking counselors indicated they just didn't know what was happening to kids who had been displaced by the new population. The general

feeling was that they all have very heavy caseloads, they had a new task to perform (job development), and there was plenty of work to be done with the kids who had enrolled in the program. It was interesting to note that although most counselors made it clear that their primary task was to help prepare young people for employment, many indicated that a good deal of time was spent (some their own time) counseling with individual students. Some said the counseling was only related to jobs but a number indicated that increasingly they were helping students with personal and family problems. This seemed particularly true in the schools with high Asian enrollments and probably reflected the concentrated nature of their problems and their responsiveness to a warm, supportive adult.

In one of the two district high schools where black students still comprised the majority of the client group, the counselor commented on the change from subsidized to private sector jobs. He maintained that the new arrangement was much better for the students and that evaluating job performance in the public sector jobs had been very sloppy. He maintained that it was better not to have <u>any</u> subsidized jobs because they could become a trap both for the students and the counselors making it easy not to face up to the real world problems of the private sector. Student work attitudes and habits would improve, he maintained, when they were judged by a more rigorous standard. The counselor recounted comments from young people who had been in public sector jobs who joked about getting paid for drinking Coke and sitting around. The seriousness of public sector supervisors in evaluating WTP students was questioned. Most counselors, however, believed there should still be the opportunity for some subsidized placement, particularly with non- or limited-English speakers or other hard-to-place students.

When asked what they actually did during the work day, counselors indicated they spent about half their time working directly with students individually or

carrying out workshops and other group programs. The rest of the day was generally spent in job development, carried out in a variety of ways depending on the style of the counselor. Some went door-to-door or called local businesses on the phone in the hope of generating job possibilities. Others developed a more sophisticated network of neighborhood organizations such as Chambers of Commerce, Rotary Clubs, etx., working through them to find a broader constituency. In some cases, the WTP counselor worked closely with the PIPE coordinator for that high school to develop jobs through the school's business partner. These were the activities most counselors indicated as essential to their own jobs and they believed they spent the major part of their time carrying out these tasks. In a later section, we will comment on the activities they found least essential. It was clear, however, that the counselors saw clear congruity between their personal purpose for their work and the way in which their time was spent.

All the counselors, with one exception, felt that the change to a building-based program enhanced their ability to work more directly with young people, to have continuing and more frequent contacts with them, and to allow them to consult with the other adults working with those same students. One counselor felt isolated and not integrated into the ongoing program of the high school. This person felt that there had been more support when all the counselors had worked together out of the central administrative offices. Others commented that there was some sense of distance from the rest of the school program, but most felt this was a temporary condition that would change as staff became more aware of the program and its intent. Most counselors saw themselves taking an aggressive approach with school staff to present their program and work with teachers and other counseling personnel.

Within their own WTP organization, counselors felt a close relationship. Many had worked together for some time and most had been in the program when all counselors operated out of the central administrative offices. There seemed to be frequent contact among counselors, particularly those who worked in the same general geographic area. Telephone calls appeared to be almost daily, especially to exchange information about potential jobs. The central office had provided a mechanism for centralizing and sharing job information and counselors extended this practice on their own initiative. The nature of Seattle's district-wide desegregation plan meant that students often went to school outside of their neighborhoods. A counselor might end up developing a job for a resident student attending another school and he or she would swap this kind of assistance with other counselors.

The closest contact in schools for all WTP counselors was with the career counselor who ran the career centers. In addition to working in the same place, the activities carried out by both people were very similar. They both conducted workshops in job search skills, concentrating on resume writing, application writing and interviewing. In fact, in most cases there appeared to be little difference between the work being done by the career and the WTP counselors. The major difference lay in the targeted nature of the WTP population and a greater emphasis on jobs rather than general career exploration. In some schools, the two counselors worked closely together and literally merged their programs, even assisting each other in job development. The openness and reciprocity of the relationship was dependent on the willingness of both types of counselors to ignore turf considerations or narrow target definitions and work with the kids who came into the center. In other schools, the relationship was relatively friendly but separate.

There was virtually no contact between the WTP counselors and the vocational education teachers in the high school, despite the seeming logic of a close working relationship. Occasionally a counselor would mention having spoken to a vocational education teacher but it was usually to work out a scheduling arrangement for a particular student -- a contact no different than with any other teacher. There were clear indications at the building and administrative levels that the two programs conceived and implemented in a completely separate fashion. There was certainly no impression that a conscious effort was being made by the district administration to encourage or suggest a closer relationship.

Relationships with other school staff were primarily dependent upon the style of the particular counselor and the environment of the school. Some appeared to be well integrated into the regular staff while others felt some degree of isolation. Most felt that there was not great clarity about their role in the school and believed there was considerable misinformation about the program and its clients.

It was interesting to note that WTP counselors had little contact with other CETA-funded programs, with the exception of the summer youth program in which many counselors worked. For the most part, they were unfamiliar with the activities and experiences of the school district and city staff members working in the Out-of-School program.

The WTP counselors, as mentioned earlier, on the whole felt their organization was characterized by good working relationships. One of the reasons for this was the relative stability of staff and a general agreement about the direction and scope of the program. It appeared as though administrators had worked carefully with staff to involve them in the planning for the reductions made in the program during the summer of 1981.

In addition, nearly all the counselors expressed the feeling that they were given a fair amount of discretion to work as they wanted to (within the guidelines)

and did not feel their supervisors were breathing down their necks. They saw themselves as professionals who were basically self-directed in their program goals and their work activities. Formal evaluation by supervisors did not assume great importance to a number of counselors because there was regular contact between them and their supervisors where work problems were openly discussed. The relationship seemed primarily collegial with assistance more the goal than monitoring. In almost every case, there was a strong sense on the part of counselors that their understanding of their job corresponded closely with that of their supervisors. One pointed out that some of the counselors had themselves been supervisors in the summer program so they had a double perspective. Concerns were expressed by a few counselors that their evaluation did not help them in any way -- that it was irrelevant. Some felt that they were being measured by their supervisors on the basis of completed paperwork and numbers of placements rather than on the quality of their work with young people. In virtually all cases, evaluation was not seen as an important tool in improving performance. The entire staff met once a week and the two direct supervisors visited schools once or twice a week. Telephone conversations were frequent.

It was also interesting to note that the major concerns expressed by staff in regard to their work had little to do with the administrative structure above them or the environment in which they worked. On the contrary, the frustrations most commonly mentioned had to do with the problems their clients were facing or that were endemic to the particular population they were serving.

The general economic downturn was working against young people entering the job market, particularly if they had few skills or little work experience. Private sector jobs were limited in their range (primarily fast foods and janitorial services) and the current job market brought CETA-eligible young people

into sharp competition with other young people who might have better access to jobs through family connections, and with older people who were also looking for jobs. Several counselors commented that even McDonald's, the traditional haven for fast job placement as well as fast foods, was hiring increasing numbers of retirement-aged people. Especially disadvantaged in this process were younger workers -- 14-15 years old -- who had been placed in day care centers and as recreation aides during the subsidized job phase of the program. Older students had a greater possibility of placement in private sector jobs.

As we have mentioned before, the problems of communicating with and placing the non- or limited-English speakers was probably the most common complaint. One counselor complained how unfair it was that she was evaluated on the basis of placement when so many young people were not ready for jobs and so many were difficult to place because of language limitations. It was not surprising, she maintained, that there was a growing tendency to work with the most qualified, job-ready students because they were more easily placed. This meant that often those who most needed help were given less attention. During the period of subsidized jobs, an emphasis of the program was to work with those who most needed help. Looking ahead, it was forecast that even more difficult problems would develop once the most advanced students had already been placed.

Despite the problems and frustrations noted in working with the Asian refugees, the satisfaction of dealing with young people who were grateful for any assistance and willing to do any job was very real for a number of counselors. When Asian students were placed in a private sector job, employers expressed considerable enthusiasm for their performance and their work attitudes and habits.

A clear sense of distance from the CETA administrative structure above their immediate supervisors was implied by almost every counselor. There is good evidence that this came as a result of the more dispersed nature of the program with individual counselors working independently out of the ten high schools. They appeared to be identifying increasingly with the school staff and student population with which they worked on a daily basis. This does not negate the close working relationship with other counselors in the WTP program, but it appeared to change the nature and patterns of day-to-day conversation about organizational climate and issues. The "organization" might well have changed from WTP to the particular high school. Because the WTP counselors were not fully integrated into that system, they may also have escaped the intraschool or districtwide organizational political involvement.

This may explain why CETA "politics" at either the Seattle or Washington, D.C. level entered very little into our conversations with counselors. This does not imply that the results of funding and programmatic decisions made at various levels of CETA were not considered critical by WTP staff. But we sensed that it was the results that appeared important in terms of their impact on the work being done by counselors and on their clients, rather than the process by which the decisions had been made. Although it was clear that the results of actions taken by Congress or the agency were crucial, there appeared little effort to track back up through the system for information as to how the decisions were made.

We found this same phenomenon operating as we tried to track a decision through the WTP organization. We were curious as to how and by whom the decision was made to shift to private sector job placement, especially since neither the City's Out-of-School program nor the County's youth program responded to the need to cut in that way. Among the answers we received was that the decision had been shaped by the full staff, by the program manager,

by the school district administrator who oversaw the CETA-funded project, and by the local CETA prime sponsor, the Consortium. Actually for us, where the decision was made became less important than the fact of the uncertainty on the part of the staff in regard to it.

Two things may explain the uncertainty. There may have been enough involvement by the counselors and other staff in the planning stage that many felt they had at least played a role in the final redesigned program. It may also have reflected general satisfaction with the way the plan was working and the fact that it was perceived by those most directly involved in delivering the program as an improvement over previous years' efforts. If the new program had been a clear disaster, it might have been far more important for staff to analyze and fix blame for the decision to change in this particular way. In the final section we will comment further on some of the organizational issues raised by these observations.

A few counselors we interviewed had obviously thought about some organizational and administrative factors they felt affected program outcomes. Among these a major complaint was that there appeared to have been little effort (or effective effort) to anticipate outcomes of certain decisions. For instance, one counselor pointed to the fact that the overwhelming numbers of Asians who had filled the summer job slots had been allowed to move directly into the year-round program with no apparent thought given to how the program should or even how it would be altered by this changed population.

Another comment was made about the results of an immediate and complete shift away from subsidized jobs with inadequate consideration of the impact this decision would have on placing hard-to-place young people, either special education or the non- or limited-English speakers. This change to unsubsidized jobs was added to a particularly hard-to-place population and counselors' performance was then measured on placement rates. The fact that this pressure to

place must almost inevitably lead to "creaming" appeared not to have been given sufficient consideration.

In general, however, many staff spoke primarily about funding levels and delays and the constraints imposed by specific regulations when asked to comment on the impact of policies. They were sometimes not clear whether decisions were made locally or in Washington, D.C. One counselor said she thinks the policies from Washington, D.C. seem "to fit in all right with local reality" or at least she felt she could interpret policy to conform to her program needs. She went on to comment that local administrators had also been pretty flexible in their directives. Another noted that the chemistry of the staff and the structure of supervision had allowed counselors to adapt the program to fit needs as they saw them.

Everyone in the program complained of the instability of CETA financing and the demoralizing effect that had on staff. Uncertain funding has long been a CETA hallmark, but frustration during the time of our interviews was particularly intense. At this time CETA's overall future was looking increasingly doubtful. Efforts to plan long term programs to meet the long term needs of students were crippled. In addition to this general concern, there was a real danger (as we mentioned earlier) that Title IV funds would not be available, forcing young people into competition with adults for the Title IIB monies. An agreement was reached by the Employment and Training Consortium's Advisory Council that youth programs would be given IIB dollars if Title IV funds were indeed unavailable. Cuts in overall funding had already been announced so it was clear major reductions would have to be made across all programs. This pressure combined with the uncertainty about Title IV funding may well have influenced the decision to eliminate completely the subsidized job aspect of the in-school program, making it consistent with the IIB requirements. Conjectures of this sort, suggested by various staff people, again put into question just where the decision was

made in redesigning the Work Training Program's new approach.

In terms of specific policies or regulations promulgated at various levels, comments were made about the burden of reporting requirements. When asked what activities they performed they considered least essential to their work, most counselors mentioned paperwork but nearly everyone added that the burden was less than it had been in previous years because they no longer had to report on individual site visits. Some criticized the fact that they were required to report on each contact they made in the process of developing jobs. Others tailored this requirement by only reporting on results. A couple of counselors mentioned that they actually passively resisted paperwork and didn't comply to the letter of the regulation. One stated that she "never let reporting interfere with her job." Another one commented that paperwork came with the job and is inevitable but it wasn't enough of a problem to obscure the real purpose of the work. Lack of feedback from reporting was a major complaint and to a person they felt it served no purpose. There was certainly no indication that supervisors hassled staff excessively over paperwork.

Policies and regulations that presented more serious problems for counselors were those that affected young people directly. This included facets of eligibility requirements and the need for complete eligibility checks. Refugees weren't asked many questions since they are automatically eligible for welfare when they arrive in this country. Young blacks, however, were often discouraged from enrolling in the program because their families did not want to go through the checking process. Three counselors commented on the problems created for those on welfare grants when they are employed in the private sector. Although the refugees recognize that their salaries will be deducted from their welfare grants, most are willing to accept this in order to have the work experience.

We have already mentioned at length some of the concerns expressed over the change to a completely unsubsidized job program. In addition to believing this extreme position limits flexibility in meeting the needs of individual students, counselors felt they were being unfairly evaluated on the basis of the number of placements made. One counselor pointed out that no attention was paid to the population and economy of the assigned unit when establishing an individual employee's placement rate.

3. Young People's Perceptions and Experiences

In talking to young people during the course of our study in Seattle, we were faced with the phenomenon of a greatly swollen refugee population in this particular site. It was due to the timing of the waves of Southeast Asians coming into this country and to the unanticipated results of an unplanned policy -- open enrollment from the summer youth program into the year-round one. It is clear that this phenomenon made interpretation of our evidence more complicated. At the same time it gave us an opportunity to look at the response of an organization to a set of unexpected factors; to see how the organization and the individuals within coped and made programmatic modifications.

Our interviewing strategies were influenced by these circumstances. We chose to talk to a disproportionate number of blacks currently enrolled in the Seattle program. (Approximately half of the young people interviewed were black.) This decision was made for several reasons. First, the interview tool we had developed and were using at our other sites was designed for young people born and brought up in this country. We found that for the Indochinese refugee students, even those who were relatively fluent in English, some of the questions just did not make sense to them because they were based on an assumed set of terms and values and culture with which they were still not familiar.

Second, we felt that black students will probably again become the major minority in any work training program carried out by the Seattle Public Schools.

It is clear that the mix of minorities has changed and that blacks are becoming a less dominant group but they still are the leading minority in the city and in the schools. We therefore talked with young people who more closely resembled the traditional population mix (and most likely the future one) than existed at the time of our interviews.

In deciding which young people we would interview, we relied on the randomness produced by a wide range of student class and lunch schedules. It was too difficult to work around student schedules and so we would interview whichever students were available.

In terms of characteristics, among the black students, most lived with one parent, usually the mother, and a number lived with other relatives (grandmother, sister, etc.). Although a high mobility rate was evident in most backgrounds, either from city to city, or within cities, most had not been out of school for any extended length of time. Among black students, both boys and girls, one of the most interesting points was the extensive and varied nature of work experience. Nearly all had held at least two jobs and many had held more. Some had come through the WTP program but quite a number came as the result of their own efforts or those of family members or friends. It is important to note that the youngest student we talked to was 16 and most were 17-19.

Across groups of students, most of the ones we interviewed appeared serious, intent on getting through school and finding work. Many commented on the hard economic times and were aware of the strong competition for jobs. Quite a number indicated they liked school for reasons ranging from "it's something to do" to "it will benefit me in the future." Of their friends, most were still in school and generally like school -- a common modifier following a pause was "sort of." Most students had taken no more than one or two vocational education classes with the exception of typing which almost all the girls (and many of the boys) had

taken. As mentioned before, the number of vocational education courses offered in Seattle high schools is very limited and the range of particular classes is dependent on the ones taught in each high school. Typing and other business machine classes are given in all schools.

Quite a number of students indicated that they would like to go on for further education after graduation from high school. Only one student stated flatly that he could hardly wait to get out of high school and certainly did not intend to go on for further education. This general interest in continuing was again reflected in affirmative responses to questions that probed the student's perception of the relationship between success in later life and working hard while in school and getting more education beyond high school.

It is interesting to note this declaration of a desire to continue education in light of the current reality of post high school graduation opportunities. As we pointed out earlier, 55 percent of students completing high school in Seattle continue with any form of education.[3] The likelihood of CETA-eligible young people being among the remaining 45 percent who do go on for postsecondary education has been sharply affected in Washington State by the economic downturn, rising tuitions, enrollment lids and the reduced availability of student financial assistance.

It is difficult to interpret the affirmative response to questions about further education on the part of the young people being interviewed. They may have assumed that those responses were what university researchers might expect or want to hear. Another explanation might be that young people, particularly with the growing emphasis on career exploration and counseling, believe they can't get jobs without additional schooling. This reading of reality may also be reflected in answers to the questions regarding the kind of education they want. Boys, especially, often mentioned education and career goals that on the

surface appeared inconsistent with present direction and performance. Boys who had not taken advanced math or science courses of any kind talked of wanting to go to a university ond on to medical or architectural schools or into sophisticated computer programming careers. Part of this attitude might have stemmed from the feeling of school people, particularly career counselors, that CETA-eligible minority kids would never aspire beyond their current vocational experiences unless they were encouraged to believe that they actually could become doctors or architects. For some of the young people, however, there were major gaps between the aspirations generally encouraged and the particular tools they were acquiring.

Girls, on the other hand, seemed to have a more realistic and more traditional set of expectations for themselves. Those who had taken a couple of years of typing and had worked in an office wanted to go on to business school. Girls who had worked in a beauty shop wanted to take cosmetology courses in community college. Those who had taken high school classes in commercial food preparation saw themselves continuing for further vocational training in that area in a community college. The fact that most of the black students lived with their mothers as the single, working parent undoubtedly shaped the attitudes and aspirations of the girls about their work.

An additional factor in this observation may lie in the fact that few of the boys we interviewed had taken specific skills preparation courses in vocational education. They had not been exposed to "hands-on" instruction from people who had had experience in a particular field of work and who knew directly the requirements of the workplace. What seemed to be absent from the preparation of these young people was the concept of graduated work skills with prescribed levels of performance. Among both boys and girls, those who seemed to have the firmest grasp of appropriate preparation for work were those who had worked with

a parent or relative in a family business or occupation. One boy had been working with his uncle in a janitorial service for several years; another had worked with his father in a body shop. An interesting contrast can be seen with the Southeast Asian students. While some of them had had little formal schooling, most had worked with their families either on farms or shops in their home countries or in refugee camps. As we mentioned earlier, once these young people could be placed, employers were impressed with their work habits and attitudes. We will discuss issues involving the school/work relationship further in the next section.

In terms of actual work experience, all of the young people we interviewed had had at least two jobs, several as many as four or five. It is important to note again at this point, that all of the students were older representing the easier-to-place category. Work Training Program and summer youth jobs up until the fall of 1981 had all been in the public sector. They included primarily office work, day care, maintenance and recreational jobs. Among the individual resumes were both private sector jobs which young people had found on their own and those that had been generated since the beginning of the district's new program approach in September 1981. Included in the private sector jobs, those in fast food places and other restaurants were the most common. Following that were various kinds of office/clerical jobs. Jobs which young people had found on their own (or with the help of family and friends) generally speaking lasted longer than the public sector jobs. It was too early to tell about the longevity of the private sector jobs that had been generated by WTP counselors.

Most of the young people liked their current and past jobs for a variety of reasons. These ranged from: "It's something to do," to recognizing the opportunity to meet new people and have new experiences. When questioned about the thing(s) they liked best about their jobs, their comments were interesting in that they overwhelmingly reflected an emphasis on social factors. Money was not

a common response to what they liked best. More frequently mentioned were the people they worked with and the people they met. They almost uniformly liked to keep busy; in fact, a common complaint concerned jobs where there was not enough to do. A number said that working made them feel grown up: coworkers "ask me for my opinion and take my advice...this makes me feel good." Another said: "They appreciate my work...they take me seriously...I feel responsible." A few mentioned gaining specific skills and work experience but by far the most often heard comment about likeing work was: "The people."

Among the complaints repeated most often were that the work was boring -- there was nothing to do; the boss was mean, or the work was messy and unpleasant. Only one student commented that the job was not interesting and that he did not see it helping him toward a career. More than half said there was "nothing" that they disliked about their jobs. However, at the same time, very few saw any activity on the job site that they would necessarily like to do for a living. There was a strong sense that this was a temporary, usually pleasant experience but one that did not have a significant relationship to the rest of their lives. There appeared little assumption that the work they were doing, or had done, in jobs would become permanent or full-time.

Money was not mentioned as one of the things young people like best about their current jobs. However, later in the interviews we asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement that the main reason for working was to make money. Many students agreed with the statement, although a number qualified their responses with comments such as: "But you have to like what you're doing." Many of them believed that work would be an important part of their lives. When asking if most of the people they knew liked to work, it became important to differentiate between their peers and adults. They assumed that most adults they knew liked to work but the usual response in regard to their peers was

either "not much" or "sort of." However, in questioning them about their two best friends' attitudes, most said that these friends liked work or would like it if they could get a job.

In regard to job search experiences, we asked students if they had met anyone at school who could help them find a full-time job. A number answered "no." We also asked them what they would do first off if they had to find a new job right away. In both cases, the Work Training Program counselor was named most frequently as their first resource. In the case of finding a new job immediately, many students suggested they would first check the newspaper ads. A number mentioned that they would ask friends while others said they would either telephone or go door-to-door to businesses applying for a job. Only a few mentioned their parents or family friends as being among the first people they would contact when looking for work. The WTP counselor was also responsible for finding the majority of present jobs or recently held ones. This was of course true of all the public sector, subsidized jobs from the previous phase of the CETA program. There were a few young people who had found jobs on their own or with the help of family or friends.

Young people generally felt there were adults who had provided them with help while they were in school. Work Training Program counselors, teachers and other counselors were named most frequently. A few mentioned family members or adult friends. A majority felt that most of the adults with whom they had come into contact in school cared whether they did well or not, although a few went on to distinguish between those who did and those who didn't. In some cases, students believed that their counselors cared but often teachers did not. Others were careful to say that some teachers had cared while others had not and they were not willing to generalize. In the interviews we felt the young people

were unusually open and willing to give their opinions freely in what might be considered sensitive or risky matters.

On the whole, the students we talked to in Seattle seemed earnest and serious in their attempt to find jobs. Some of the Southeast Asian students appeared anxious and sometimes discouraged about their capacity to learn enough English to find jobs. Not many of the young people had clearly identified vocational goals or strategies to achieve goals. In this, it seems safe to say, they are not different from many other young people. Most appeared relatively positive about their school connections but this was nearly always expressed in terms of their relationship with their friends and with a limited number of adults, most often the WTP counselor. For nearly every student, it appeared clear that this was a person they trusted and whom they believed cared about them and their future.

Out-of-School Program

The description of the City of Seattle's Out-of-School Program will follow the same general pattern as that of the school district's program. After a brief review of the components of the city's major youth employment effort, we will look at changes that were being implemented during the fall we began our interviewing. These changes came almost entirely as a result of reductions in funding levels. We will report next on the perceptions of key staff people in the organization and then at observations of clients of the program.

1. Structure and Organization of Youth Employment Training Program

Seattle's Out-of-School Program was commonly referred to YETP -- the Youth Employment Training Program. It was operated with CETA funds by the Division of Youth Services in the City's Department of Human Resources and was specifically designed to provide services for young people who had dropped out of the regular school system. The City contracted with the Seattle school district to operate an educational component in the program while City staff handled the employment section. The City also carried on an extensive summer youth program funded by CETA and its Department subcontracted with a number of community-based organizations to run several other youth employment projects.

During the year of our interviews, six teachers were in the educational unit. One of these served as head teacher and manager of the school component. Another school staff members was office manager and taught clerical skill classes part-time. The program's main focuses were on preparation for the GED, basic skills, behvaior improvement and the development of life skills. Young people went to classes three hours a day with a morning and an afternoon session. Classes were small and the work was high individualized following a rigorous assessment upon entry into the program. There was some small group work but most of the attention was provided on an individual basis. Volunteers were used by teachers to give student as much assistance as possible.

The second component of the YETP centered on work experience. There were four employment specialists and a supervisor in this unit. Among the functions carried out by the specialists were needs assessment, development of job search skills, subsidized job placement, counselling and monitoring of job performance. When young people exited from the program, they received assistance from the employment specialists in efforts to find a private sector job. Students were required to perform well in the classroom unit before they were given a subsidized job. Strict rules had been established in terms of the number of hours students had to work to stay in school and the hours they had to be in the classroom in order to be eligible to participate in the work experience component. Young people generally went to class three hours a day and worked 25 hours a week. Strict rules of attendance and punctuality were enforced throughout the program.

The two components were housed in a closed public school which the City leased from the school district. The classroom and work experience sections were integrated in a weekly advisement session. A teacher and an employment specialist would be matched to meet with their mutual clients to discuss progress and problems developing in either the academic or work experience part of their lives. This day once a week was also used to put on skills workshops and programs on career options with outside speakers from various occupational fields.

In the school component there were 100 potential slots but at the time of our interviewing there were only 80 actually enrolled with a long waiting list. The delay in filling the slots had to do with intake and eligibility checks. Because the process and timing of establishing eligibility was separate for the two components, students were often enrolled in the classroom section before they were declared eligible for work experience. This meant that teachers were in a position to evaluate and improve general performance before young people were able to transfer into a job placement. At the time we talked to staff, there were only

95 subsidized job slots available. Staff reported there were also some clients in the program (beyond the subsidized slots) who were being placed in private sector jobs without being required to go through the school part of the program. Clients of the regular combined classroom/work experience program could only remain enrolled for nine months although some were able to extend that period by moving into the summer program.

At the time we were interviewing, the population of the program was 53% black, 28% white, 14% Hispanic and 5% Southeast Asian refugee. The City's summer youth program had had about 35% refugees because it was operated on a first-come, first-serve basis. As we mentioned earlier, the school district's Work Training Program (school-year) simply absorbed a large portion of the population from its summer program, accounting in part for the disproportionately high refugee client group. The City summer program took young people who were not dropouts but the regular YETP enrolled only drop-outs, so there was far less relationship between the two groups.

Young people came into the program primarily through word of mouth. Because there were always waiting lists, there was never any need to recruit clients. School district teachers in regular or alternative schools occasionally referred students who were considering dropping out, to the City's program. However, the more frequent route for entry was through friends who had "discovered" the program. A fewcame in off the street since YETP is located in the old Horace Mann School, located in the heart of Seattle's Central Area.

Rather substantial programmatic changes in YETP had followed budget reductions during the summer of 1981. We had been fortunate in talking with City staff during the spring of that year in a series of preliminary interviews preparing for the project. At that time, the staff was feeling great concern at what they expected would be massive cuts. In fact, YETP suffered a 55% reduction in funding from the previous year and the Entitlement program which was closely

related to YETP was terminated in August. During that spring there were 150 young people in the Youth Employment Program. It was described by the director of the City's Division of Youth Services as a unique program that subsidized the education of dropouts through the school component while providing them with work experience as well as counselling and other supportive services. In the expanded days of the program there was a full-time intake worker provided by Employment Security who was stationed in the building. The intake person also determined eligibility. Following screening, assessment and orientation, new clients would move into the classroom segment of the program and then into the work experience and subsidized job component.

In addition to teachers and employment specialists, prior to Fall 1981, there was also a staff of counselors who provided supportive services and also worked out contracts with individual young people in terms of appropriate work behavior and job readiness. Clients were allowed to spend a whole year in the program or a few months, depending on how long it took them to get their GED. They were given a fair degree of flexibility in determining how rapidly they would move through the classroom phase. YETP was funded under Title IV and followed those guidelines in terms of subsidized jobs placement.

With the 55% reduction confirmed during the summer of 1981, YETP was faced with making major changes in its program. It took a very different direction than the school district had done and decided to keep young people on subsidized jobs. They decided not to serve as many young people -- down from 120-30 subsidized slots to 95 -- and they made major cuts in their own staff. Whereas previously there had been three components, including classroom, work experience and counseling, they decided to cut out all the counselors. Eight staff positions were cut in total, leaving four employment specialists and their supervisor, six teachers, including the master teacher and the office manager, who also taught clerical courses.

The ESL person was also cut which left the program with little capacity to work with refugees. A program manager and administrative coordinator were left on the site.

Part of the programmatic change came as a result of the Employment and Training Consortium's decision to shift funds from the IIb program into the Title IV ones. In the past, under the Title IV guidelines, students in YETP were not allowed to work in the private sector. But with the merger of the Title IV and Title IIb monies, students were placed under a new set of guidelines that included those that were generally applied to an adult population. Under the IIb requirements, YETP staff was faced with having to make a certain number of non-subsidized placements at exit from the program. There were also requirements for a certain number of completed GEDs. A quota of 60 percent was established in terms of the placement rate.

This quota for placements caused a number of possibly unforeseen changes. Under previous program requirements, YETP had referred their graduates to a variety of IIb programs such as the Seattle Opportunities Industrialization Center and Operation Improvement. The City's program was considered a "feeder" into the actual training programs where participants would learn specific job skills before private sector placements. With the merging of the funds from the two Titles, YETP became a IIb program that helped students become job ready but did not give them job skills before placing them directly in the private sector. With the reduction in funds, fewer clients were in the program and with the new requirements, informal rationing processes began to change the nature of the population. More motivated and serious young people were given preference during the intake process since they would be easier to place at exit. Less well prepared kids and ones with less family support were "left by the wayside," according to the staff member.

Staff knew that their own performance would be measured on the basis of ability to meet the 60 percent quota. In fact, one person reported that people who had graduated were actually being admitted into the program for job placement in the private sector, helping to fill the quota. This kind of "creaming" had never become prevalent under the Title IV requirements for young people because progress couldn't be defined and measured in such precise terms.

In interviewing staff members after the changes in the fall of 1981, it was interesting to note some of their positive feelings about the change. There was a feeling that in some senses the program had been too attractive before. Clients earned high wages for participating and they had little real incentive to get out and get a "real" job. A good deal of leeway was given to young people in terms of the time they were allowed to stay in the program and receive a subsidized education. Some had been in the program well over a year without completing their GEDs. An additional comment was that there may have been an overload of people working with clients. A number of staff members felt the program worked in a much more coordinated way without the third adult -- the counselor -- as part of the process. Both teachers and employment specialists felt that they were able to provide a more coherent plan of service for each student and through the new advisement approach were able to integrate better the classroom and employment aspects of each student's program.

With enrollment more limited than in previous years, students appeared to feel more strongly the need to work hard and make progress. In the past, a common complaint had been irregular attendance on the part of students. Apparently, starting in the fall of 1981 more rigorous standards were applied to students and both attendance and punctuality records began to improve markedly. Everyone seemed to feel at that early stage that the new program was working well. Students were learning that they had to perform well in the classroom first, before they could be transferred to job placement. There was also the perception on the part

f staff that the reorganization and honing down of the program had resulted in a better program, brought about in part by the process of thinking through the goals and methods that YETP was using to prepare young people better for employment.

2. Delivery-Level Perceptions, Problems and Working Relations

a. Classroom component. The teachers in the classroom component of the Youth Employment Training Program had all worked for the Seattle School District in other capacities before joining the City's CETA-funded program. Some had worked in regular schools but all had worked in various alternative programs and three had taught in the school component of the Youth Service Bureau, a joint city/school district juvenile diversionary project. One had worked in the special school run by the district for pregnant girls and teen-age mothers. One teacher had spent many years as a Title I reading specialist and had also worked teaching in the special school operated in the King County juvenile probation and parole program. Most of the teachers had shifted to YETP when their alternative programs had been eliminated or reduced as a result of funding cuts. Other job experiences included psychiatric social work, counseling and work in an advocacy agency for delinquents.

Without exception, the teachers' attention was focused on the students, their needs, and ways to improve their basic skills. The curriculum and methods discussed by the teachers reflected a strong emphasis on individualized instruction and flexible teaching strategies. All of them found the YETP setting, which was similar to the alternative programs they had worked in before, comfortable with a considerable and necessary amount of discretion. Teachers expressed the purpose of their own work as helping students learn academic and life survival skills, to help them understand society and see their place in it, and to help them see what they can do. All felt that these students responded better to this environment than they could to a regular classroom because of the individual attention they received and the ability to tailor the program to fit individual needs.

The general portrait painted of the young people in YETP proved to be consistent among the teachers. A majority of the students in the classes were black. Of the girls, almost half were pregnant or already had babies. About half lived with a parent or other family member. The other half in various situations -- as heads of households, alone, with friends. Nearly all had come from disrupted families; they had moved a lot and their time in school was marked by disruption, poor performance and alienation. They had left school because they were bored or felt overwhelmed, often by so many other problems outside of school. Money was a problem for all the students. They faced tense financial situations personally and tough employment prospects and at the same time lacked education and were caught in economic troubles that were outside of their control.

Their skill levels were low but many students were very motivated and had worked exceptionally hard in the classroom program. The teacher mentioned earlier who had years of experience in Title I teaching is considered by many to be the best reading teacher in the Seattle School District. It has been said that she can teach anyone to read. In describing the students who had come to her in the program, she is very frustrated at the number who want to enter with skills at the intermediate level (3-4-5-6 grades). She felt that it is almost impossible to bring them up to the GED level in the time allowed in the program. She also knows that there is nowhere else in the system where these young people can get the help they need. The normal range of students was at the 7-9 grade level and these can generally be brought to the appropriate level to pass the GED.

She described a number of students who were pre-primer -- they have a sight vocabulary of about 20 words. She worked with these students and had brought them to 1-2 grade levels. Some who tested at the 3rd grade level were approaching the end of the 5th grade. Generally speaking, they have to turn away anyone with 3rd grade level skills. She was strong in her praise for their motivation and

willingness to work. Although they obviously had learning disabilities, these kids were not retarded. She said that one of the pre-primer students tested at a high level in math -- he was able to do algebra. Several of the students working at this level turned out to be good performers on the job.

This teacher believed that part of the problem is systemic. Certain students judged as having language learning disabilities actually have language maturation lag. With so much extra assistance concentrated on elementary schools, there has been little effort to work with young people whose brains are perhaps not ready to read until they are in their mid-teens. They become alienated from school. She described it as a matter of time, facility and flexibility. If the system could provide opportunities for that student to do things he could do well, such as art or certain kinds of work experiences while waiting to cope with reading, the almost irreparable problems of alienation and low self-esteem would not develop. As we mentioned earlier, the number of Southeast Asian refugees enrolled in this program was small, so these comments do not reflect the special problems the limited- or non-English speakers experience in programs of this kind. Most of the refugee young people were enrolled in the school district program. In fact, once the YETP had lost its ESL counselor, staff in the City's program worked to transfer these students into programs that had the capacity to help them improve their English.

Teachers in this program appeared to have very close working relationships among themselves. One teacher commented that there was considerably more cooperation among teachers in this program than among public school faculties generally. These good relationships appeared in the fall of 1981 to be extending increasingly to the employment specialists who worked in the same building. The person who had originally designed the mixed school/work program commented that traditionally in programs of this type teachers and employment people hardly spoke to each other but now the work of the two professionals was really meshing.

The goals of the classroom component now were based on an interpretation of the joint goals of the total program.

It also seemed clear that an unanticipated result of the funding cuts during the previous summer which eliminated the counseling unit may have served to improve the way the program worked. Teachers and specialists were picking up the counseling function in their work with students. A coherent approach to each student was growing from the advisement meetings where pairs of teachers and specialists met weekly with their mutual clients (usually around 15). At these sessions the two adults and the young person discussed issues such as school progress, "next steps," what was happening on jobs, and career information. This device was developing a well integrated system of information and advice with the client as the focus of attention. The thought was expressed several times that in the previous year's program, people were practically falling over each other and in the process little productive, coordinated activity was taking place. The teaching component held regular staff meetings once a week or more often, and saw each other daily.

A common complaint mentioned by the teachers was that they felt extremely isolated from other programs working with similar groups of young people. They frequently said they never had any contact with other CETA-funded programs for young people including the WTP operated by the school district, and were not aware of the direction and activities of that effort. One teacher asserted strongly, with many years of experience in the district system, that there was no coordination or even sharing of information at the administrative level and little encouragement for cooperative efforts down through the system to the delivery level. One teacher rather plaintively said that he wished he had more information about what is taught in similar programs and how it is taught, especially in the community colleges. Admitting they could take more initiative in developing these links, each one commented on the absorbing nature of their

day-to-day work with young people that left them with little energy for pursuing other contacts.

Again, the former Title I teacher had some interesting comments. She said she felt one of the greatest problems in the system was the lack of information about the various populations served and those who were not being served. In this second group she placed those 16-21 years old whose reading skills are at the intermediate level (3-4-5-6 grade level) whom she believes were not being served anywhere in the larger education and employment system. She felt it would be extremely helpful for staff to know more about programs that are available district-wide and to have in-service sessions for the people in different programs in order to find out where the gaps and duplications are. Only in this way could the appropriate people at the delivery level know how to recommend where kids should go. Currently, kids who end up in appropriate programs do so by sheer chance or by the perseverance of a particular adult who cares what happens to that particular young person. Many more never find a place where they can be helped, even though sometimes such a place might exist. Eventually, in this way, you could account for the kids that the system simply wasn't able to serve to see if there are alternative sources for help in other systems.

She recognized that this implies a complex and diversified system with a management approach that could cope with a larger, more diversified program with different components. This would imply a greater degree of cooperation within the school district and among the district, the city and other public and private entities that educate and prepare young people for employment.

In terms of the organization in which the teachers work, they defined it as that particular project -- YETP -- rather than the larger organization of either the school district or the City's Department of Human Resources. Each felt there was appropriate discretion to carry out the job and felt little constraint imposed by the supervisor, the organization or the guidelines of the program.

Relationships appeared entirely collegial where evaluation or comment was intended and taken as an effort to do the job better. The fact that the supervisor was "one of them" -- a teacher in the program -- in all likelihood played a role in this supportive environment. The teachers' world seemed in many ways self-contained with little attention being focused on external factors affecting the program . Energy and effort appeared expended almost exclusively on the task at hand.

When asked about time spent on what might be considered non-essential tasks, most said they found little asked of them that fit in this category. With two exceptions, there was little comment on paperwork. The supervisor did have a lot of paperwork as did the office manager but both felt that that requirement was merely part of their job and didn't see it as onerous or distracting from programmatic responsibilities. One teacher in commenting that he had few non-essential activities, said that when he was not being productive -- in his terms, working directly with kids -- he is "catching his breath."

With the exception of of the classroom supervisor, there was little knowledge or particular interest voiced about the workings of the organization extending above the teachers. One said that, very fortunately, worrying about CETA, school district or city politics was not part of her job. As far as policy, guidelines and regulations were concerned, several comments were made that with this particular program one did not need to think about those things. Although recognizing there was continuing criticism about funding reductions and delays, and about changes in the program, one teacher said that he had not been involved directly in these issues. The greatest frustration he faced was neither organizational nor political but centered on the ability to make a positive impact on the lives of these kids in such a short period of time.

Another commented that although she felt this kind of program was more likely to help young people than a more traditional one, there were still changes she

wished could be made to help the young people face the almost overwhelming array of problems most of them faced. She had been urging strongly the installation of a day care center at the Horace Mann site of the program to make coming to school less of a problem for many students and to provide day care jobs. Other day care facilities were inaccessible to their client group. In addition, the funding for day care and other support services had been sharply reduced. This teacher pointed out that just coming to school and working presented problems for many of these young people and adding on the unavailability of day care made the load too heavy for some to carry.

In terms of the organization within the project, there was general agreement that paring down the program staff had actually improved the ability of the staff to work together and focus on the needs of clients in a more coordinated fashion.

b. Employment Specialists. Interviews with the YETP's employment specialists provided perceptions that in most cases were quite similar to those of the project's working staff. We will comment, therefore, primarily on differences between the two groups.

The backgrounds of the specialists were different in that most had been involved in youth and recreation work and community service work. One had a masters in social work and another had been a client of this program's antecedent in the 1960s. Several had worked in other CETA-funded projects.

Three functions had been folded into the work that was being done by the employment specialists following the reorganization of the program during the summer of 1981. Each specialists at the time of our interviews was responsible for counseling, skills coordination, and employment development. Because of funding cutbacks, they saw themselves as becoming generalists. The consensus was that the new streamlined program was more efficient and allowed for greater coordination. Cooperating with teachers in developing a coherent plan for

helping each young person was a primary goal.

Orientation into the program was provided by the classroom and employment supervisors working together. The young person would move into the education component first. When progress had been made in their classroom work, the students shifted into the work experience part of the program. The specialist then followed the individual through the rest of the program, covering a spectrum of tasks from helping the client to indentify goals, carrying out a needs assessment, placing in an appropriate subsidized job, monitoring on the job site, and finally helping in private sector job placement at exit from the program.

Part of the monitoring function included determining whether the young person understood what was expected of him or her on the job. One counselor commented that the main point of the subsidized job was to get the young person prepared for the private sector. He emphasized, therefore, the importance of becoming dependable, improving and learning from the job. If the counselor didn't see that happening when monitoring on the job site, then he would place the client elsewhere. Agency personnel were given definite guidelines about what was expected of them in terms of supervision. Some, however, were very lax in what they expected from the kids and the employment specialist's job was to look as much at supervisory performance as client performance to ensure that the young person had the right environment for learning and improvement. As one specialist said, you have to go site by site to judge the merits of subsidized employment. Some high quality job placements such as computer work always had stringent requirements similar to those associated with the private sector.

In terms of private sector job development, the specialists saw themselves as "marketing" the skills of the student ready to leave the program. They were to act as honest advocates for the student in the private sector. As mentioned earlier, there had been no expectation of private sector placement while YETP had been exclusively a Title IV program. Students had previously been sent on

to other programs which had carried the ultimate responsibility for placement.

The whole purpose of the specialists' work was to expose youth to the work force and to the requirements of the world of work, including not only skills but also the work ethic. When they were placing kids, either in public or private sector jobs, they needed to find jobs that they could handle. The specialists' responsibility was to prepare the young people to be independent of the program, if for no other reason than it might be cut. The point was made several times that people should become more self reliant. Another problem stressed was the void between what it takes to work and what young people have learned in schools.

The employment specialists drew a very similar profile of the young people served to that drawn by the teachers, although their perspectives were somewhat different. The teachers were working with young people who were coming back into an environment which all had rejected -- the classroom. Although the employment specialists sometimes saw more feelings and aspects of the same young people, both groups of adults realized that they were dealing with individuals who had known more failure than success in their lives. One specialist divided the clients into three groups: a) low skills, not likely to complete the GED; b) good job skills but needing a push and sharpening of academic skills; c) drop-outs with good skills but personal problems. All had an accumulation of financial and personal problems which often left them feeling powerless and overburdened. A majority were heads of households, not still living with a parent. More of the young people were 18 years old than in previous years with an average age of 17-1/2 years old. Almost half of the girls in the program were pregnant or had problems. They had not recognized the responsibilities they would face when they kept their babies.

However, all the adults described the young people who were coming into the program in the fall of 1981 as strongly motivated or they would not have enrolled. The enrollees entering at this time appeared more serious and more highly skilled than had been true in the past. This did not imply that they had a more accurate picture of the work world. According to one specialist, parental neglect had helped create the situation where students didn't know what was expected of them on the job. Parents were often out of touch with how their children act and feel in part because of the impersonal environment of a big city.

The attendance rate was up both in the classroom and on the job. There was agreement that this change came as a result of a more rigorous attitude on the part of staff and the fact that there was a long waiting list to get into the program. For the first time, students received a formal, written notice if they got into trouble in the program. Fewer students were enrolled in the program at that time because of the funding reductions. One specialist commented that, with the elimination of the counseling staff, if clients are not personally prepared to get their act together, they were told they were not suited for the program. She went on to say that for some of the young people this had been a strong motivating factor, but for others, it had been discouraging, sometimes to the point of their leaving the program.

There appeared to have been a slow-down in the drop-out rate from the public schools in part because jobs were so hard to come by during the economic downturn. Many drop-outs, however, were coming from outside Seattle in hopes of finding work in the city. Without an ESL person, the program had little capacity to reach out to refugee drop-outs. Although it is impossible to tell many Southeast Asian dropouts there are, the general feeling has been that the refugee young people stay in school as long as they can because of the English language instruction and the other support they received in the public schools.

The specialists reported close working relations within their own unit and

with their supervisor. They provided help and support for each other. The employment specialists were beginning to see a closer working relationship with the teachers in the classroom unit. One specialist said the rapport with the teachers had never been better. All the specialists commented on the new "advisement" process where a paired teacher and specialist focused on their mutual clients and that individual's progress through the system. All felt that this process was working well and that it ensured that adults assumed more responsibility for each client. More special attention was possible through this approach. The three -- teacher, specialist and student -- talk about problems at work, prospects for getting the GED, and other problems being faced by the student which might make success in attaining the program's goals more difficult. The teachers helped related school work with the particular student's career needs and to motivate and aid students in their work.

Other than relations within their own unit and with the teachers, the specialists said that they did not have much contact with other people doing the same kind of work or working with the same population. In fact, they all said they had less contact than they used to. One commented that she felt this was because there was much sharper competition over placements than before. Another reported that he still referred some clients to Seattle OIC for specialized skill training, but there was much less of that interaction than previously. In the earlier period, the employment people were regularly referring people from their Title IV preparation program to other agencies' Title IIB skills training programs. In addition, some said they used to have more time to talk to others in the field but with the change in the program and the loss of the counseling unit, they were much busier. There was still some contact with the community college program because some of the YETP students wanted to take courses there.

Employment specialists described evaluation by their supervisor in much the same terms as the teachers. They saw it as an excellent source of feedback helping them do their job better. One specialist commented that he depended on advice from his supervisor because he had been involved with the program for a long time and was able to point out things that could cause trouble later. Feedback was described by another specialist as almost continuous since there is so much interaction among all staff members, including the supervisor. Evaluation was often carried on in a group so that the unit's work performance was the focus of comment rather than that of an individual. It was noted that the supervisor was able to minimize paperwork demands on the specialists and in fact that he did a good job in organizing their work with sensitivity to their needs. It was clear that the specialists as a group felt their conception of their job corresponded to that of their supervisor. In fact, it was stressed that the program and its objectives had been tailored by the entire unit working as a whole.

As we mentioned earlier, specialists agreed with teachers in their support of the reorganized program, particularly the elimination of the separate counseling unit. Most felt there had been much overlapping responsibility under the earlier approach.

Specialists had stronger responses to questions about policies and regulations that had the teachers. Concern was expressed about the new guidelines resulting in "creaming." Only students who were highly motivated and relatively strong in their skills were able to get into or stay in the program. In previous years, students could spend a whole year or more in the program depending on how long it took them to get their GEDs. Now students were being allowed only six months before they were out for placement in subsidized jobs. Among the adults there were mixed feelings in support of the motivating aspects of this toughter policy as compared to concern for the student who was always going to be the victim at

the bottom of the totem pole. Students who couldn't get into the program were simply referred back to intake agencies.

With fewer slots and a long waiting list, the program was very selective in taking applicants, accepting those who in the long run would be easier to place. The new Title IIB guidelines almost forced this kind of rationing since the program was to be evaluated on its ability to meet the new 60 percent quota for private sector placements. As one person commented, in the period when the program was phasing out of the Title IV requirements into those for IIB, funding had been determined under one set of guidelines and evaluation would be carried out under another. The somewhat cynical comment was: "that's how the government defunds." Another specialist characterized the new system as leading to evaluation on the basis of a number count rather than a quality count.

Specialists were frustrated because they were serving far fewer young people now than they had been able to in the past. With a 55 percent cut in funding, three of the City's youth programs had been consolidated into YETP. The experimental Youth Incentive Entitlement Pilot Project (YIEPP) and the Youth Community Conservation and Improvement Project (YCCIP) had been eliminated at the end of the summer of 1981 and the only program still operating was YETP. YIEPP had provided a job entitlement for eligible students who agreed to stay in school or any dropout who agreed to return to school. In addition, private sector placements had been allowed under that program but they had been subsidized at 100 percent. Even with this incentive, private employers had been reluctant to participate. Now employment specialists were trying to develop private sector jobs with no subsidies during a time of increasing general unemployment.

The consensus was that the shift to more private sector placement was good for the students in exposing them to the real work world. Students had often complained to specialists that public sector jobs were merely "make work" and did

not provide them with any real training. Most public sector placements were limited to clerical or janitorial work. However, the adults felt it would have been more realistic if flexibility had been maintained in allowing for some private sector subsidization, particularly in areas such as computer work, which were not generally available in the public sector. The OJT slots were seen as an effective way of moving toward private sector involvement. A number of people interviewed regretted the termination of the system of wage incentives which had been built into the subsidized education/jobs approach.

NOTES

1. Vocational Education Planning Study for the Seattle-King County Area, A Collaborative Effort of the King-Snohomish Manpower Consortium, Private Industry Council, Seattle Community College District, Seattle Public Schools, Washington State Department of Employment Security. Seattle, 1980.

2. Information provided by the Seattle School District.

3. "Vocational Education in the Seattle Public Schools." Prepared by the Office of the Mayor, City of Seattle. December 1981.

King County

Before looking at King County's CETA-funded work training program, it may be useful to identify certain differences between the county and the City of Seattle. Most striking, perhaps, is the physical size of the county -- more than 2,200 square miles. Its population of 1.265 million had for years been clustered in the immediate Seattle area but has been spreading into growing new suburbs well beyond the Seattle core. The CETA-eligible population is growing very fast but is still relatively dispersed. The highest concentration of low income people is in southern King County. The nature of the population has been changing in the last few years. Traditionally, an affluent mix of higher income bedroom suburban and comfortable rural communities, the county had a small percentage of minorities or low income residents. King County government operated few human service programs and had long had a policy of not relying on federal funds for continuing programs.

As the recession and rising unemployment began to be felt in 1979 and 1980, poor people began to move from Seattle into the county, particularly South King County. This shift was exacerbated by the flood of Indochinese refugees arriving in the state of Washington. At first the refugees located primarily in Seattle. With each new wave, however, pressure began to build on housing, jobs and human service agencies, forcing growing numbers into the adjacent county areas. County government was faced with a new population and a new set of problems for which there was virtually no service system in place.

Other entities in the county, however, had produced a job training system that far surpassed what was available in Seattle. In 1967, when the state community college system was established by law, the Seattle Public Schools "gave up" its vocational and technical high school for use by the new community college district which now spreads over three campuses. Some vocational education courses were offered in the high schools but as we discussed earlier, this system has

been judged inadequate and narrow in its range of offerings.

In the county, however, two school districts exercised their option of maintaining their vocational/technical high schools (now called Vocational Technical Institutes). There are five institutes of this type in the state, each administered by its resident school district in coordination with the high school vocational education programs within that district. Enrollment is not limited to district residents, and in fact, some of the VTIs operate additional facilities in other school districts. The VTIs are diversified in terms of offerings, train many people (both youth and adults) and have high placement rates. They work closely with business, particularly large corporations and with labor unions.

At the time of our interviews, Renton Voc Tech (the largest in the county) served 4,500 FTEs a year and had 24,000 students registered. The primary programs they operate include: a) preparatory programs for entry-level employment; b) skills retraining and upgrading programs; c) apprenticeship-related instruction; d) basic skills training. This institute claims a 94-96 percent placement rate. If a particular program achieves less than an 80 percent rate, it is terminated, despite the investment made in installing facilities, etc. Renton Voc Tech puts a premium on moving people through the system as quickly as they can and do not try to meet personal enrichment needs of students. The school assumes their clientele's major interest is in getting jobs. Instructors handle job placements through their contacts in the particular skill area.

If a client tests out at below 8th grade level, he or she is put into adult basic education. At the 9th grade level or above, clients may be asked to pursue remediation concurrent with their technical training. If they are close to completion of their diploma, they may be encouraged to return to high school and finish. The Voc Tech has some ESL programs. It does not participate in any college-transfer programs despite some pressure in the past to move in to this area.

It is interesting to note the relations that have existed between Renton Voc Tech and CETA. At one time RVTI was a major participant in CETA programs but this came to a halt as community-based organizations, most notably Seattle's OIC, began to expand their programs and gain political power. Administrators at RVTI felt they could not compete in political terms with these new bases of power despite the fact that they saw the CBO programs as duplication of what already existed in the vocational training system. They believed that CETA did not award its contracts on the basis of efficiency or effectiveness, of bidding and placement rates -- areas in which they held precedence after years of experience as compared to the CBOs which had entered the job training field with little conception of program design or outcomes. In addition, RVTI had a network established for private sector placement which the newer organizations could not match.

Voc Tech administrators said they didn't like to see CETA competing with the voc ed programs over training placements because, although employers might opt for CETA because it provided money for wages, the employers would not necessarily have any commitment to train the worker. They believed that the combined vocational education forces had been able to keep CETA out of the private sector in the county. All the CETA placements were in the public sector. The voc techs played a role in this configuration by threatening not to cooperate with the CETA prime sponsor in regard to student referrals, etc.

In addition to the two Vocational Technical Institutes that are located in King County, several community colleges also offer extensive vocational educational programs. Over time, a number of school districts in the county have pooled their voc ed resources in order to build skills centers. Several proprietary schools offer a variety of job training programs.

The county's CETA youth program was part of a far more developed, competitive delivery system than was either the school district's or the City of Seattle's programs. It was operated over a large geographic area where eligible populations are not heavily concentrated. As we will discuss later, this factor created problems of delivery, especially after cut-back decisions decentralized the program's operations.

1. Structure and Operations of King County's Work Training Program

When it became clear that substantial funding reductions were indeed coming to the various CETA programs in Seattle and King County, the decisions made by the county staff were quite different than those made in Seattle. First, the in-school and out-of-school programs were integrated into one. Traditionally, the program had accommodated to its broad geographic range by operating out of a number of field offices. Counselors had been stationed in various locations throughout the county, usually in high schools. Young people had come to the field offices to meet with counselors for orientation and training. They were placed in public sector jobs and monitored by the counselors. The county also operated an entitlement program in which young people received job entitlements if they agreed to stay in school or return to school. Some placements were subsidized ones in the private sector and a system of wage incentives was built into this program. Just as in Seattle, however, the entitlement program ended in August 1981.

With the cuts in program funding, the decision was made to draw all staff back to the central administrative offices in downtown Seattle. There was also a feeling that there would be a greater sense of a "team spirit" if all the counselors worked out of a common office. This meant that counselors had to drive either to the high schools where students were enrolled to meet with them there or to job sites spread all over the county. In addition to this change, staff

was reduced from about 60 to 26 positions. An entire level of management was eliminated and two training positions -- one for testing and the second for GED preparation -- were lost. Training was integrated into the responsibilities of the counselors who worked directly with young people. One person was left on staff exclusively for training. The number of counselors was down to 13 but not all were full-time (only 10 FTEs). Total enrollment was less than half of the previous year's with approximately 300 available positions at the time of our interviews.

At that time, the activities of the program included workshops and training sessions for young people on resume writing, applications and job interviews. Following the merger of the in-school and out-of-school components, WTP counselors are no longer providing any GED training but look instead to the community colleges to carry out this function. Clients from both categories (in-school and out-of-school) were placed in public sector jobs. Counselors visited them on the job sites at least once a month and monitored their performance. Some counselors worked with work site supervisors orienting them and helping to establish objectives and expectations for each enrollee. A process newly developed by staff -- the Client Performance Objectives -- was being used to measure the progress being made by the clientele in general and by each young person in the program. Meetings with young people were generally on work sites since the field offices had been eliminated. However, in a couple of cases counselors were given rooms to use in high schools to meet with their in-school clients. Some counselors spoke regularly to their clients on the phone to help them with problems that developed between regular visits. Every two weeks counselors delivered pay checks either on the work site or at the schools. Clients could only stay in the program for six months after they received their diploma or their GED.

At the time of our interviewing, the program was just initiating a new thrust

-- Intensive Placement Activity. Up until this time there had been little job development required of counselors. Most of the public sector job sites had been held over from previous years. Now, members of the staff had been formed into a task force to develop the concept of intensive placement, prepare training materials, and lay the groundwork for shifting the organization into a "placement agency" mentality. Under its original Title IV guidelines, the program had done little unsubsidized private sector placement. Staff had focused most of its efforts on job-hunting workshops and other job readiness activities. The program had emphasized work experience and work skills rather than jobs. Now, in anticipation of Title IIB requirements, there was growing stress on placement, particularly in the private sector. Staff's main experience in that area had been through the entitlement program and OJT slots. But in both those cases, the private sector jobs were either wholly or partially subsidized.

The vehicle the county WTP used to move toward private sector placement was a program called VEPs -- Vocational Exploration Program. The intent of VEPs was to give young people a variety of work experiences on a single job with a limited number of hours devoted to each task. There were problems in generating jobs that allowed for this kind of variability in function. However, the WTP was continuing the effort believing that the emphasis on a young person actually looking for a job, exploring various careers and getting placed were valuable experiences.

A program that was connected with the county WTP was operated by two counselors on the staff of the regular program. This pilot project -- Let's Work Together -- was funded through the governor's discretionary CETA monies. The grant for the project had been developed jointly by the county and three cooperating school districts. The school districts provided remedial reading and math centers in their schools for CETA-eligible kids. A career education person was also funded by the grant providing career education for the enrollees and

other students in the schools. This pilot project was the first unit in the country to try out the VEPs approach to private sector placement. About one third of the students who had been enrolled in the Let's Work Together pilot were expected to continue in the regular Work Training Program.

Special education students were included in the county's Work Training Program. There were no income requirements for the handicapped but when funding cuts were imposed demanding a much smaller population, only low-income handicapped were actually being accepted into the program. Other criteria used in the "rationing" process included age and grade in school. It was felt that older teenagers had greater needs and were more likely to be living independently away from home.

Young people entered the program through referrals either from high school counselors for the in-school or from Employment Security offices for the out-of-school group. There was a long waiting list to get into the program with many of the applicants coming out of the CETA summer program. The number of young people the program was able to serve was determined by the budget allotment from the prime sponsor which provided for a specified number of subsidized job slots. Once that determination was known, the two service supervisors distributed the slots to different counselors in the various geographic areas on the basis of need. Caseloads varied but the average was around 33. A rapidly growing number of Southeast Asians had enrolled amounting to about 40 percent of the client population overall, although there was great variance by geographic area. The highest concentration of refugees has been in South King County. At the time we talked to staff this number was no longer increasing because no new clients were coming into the program. Expecting cutbacks, the county staff had deliberately curtailed further growth of the segment so that there would not be an extreme skewing of the population. Junior high age young people had been completely cut out of the regular program as well as from the summer program.

2. Delivery-Level Perceptions, Problems and Working Relations

All the counselors interviewed had worked in the county's Work Training Program for at least four years. One had spent eight years in the regular program and had worked with summer youth before that. He was planning to leave within a few months to return to the university to get his M.B.A. All had had some graduate work and a number held masters degrees in social work. Among other job experiences represented in the group were work with handicapped children, juvenile delinquents and emotionally disturbed children. One counselor was currently serving as a field faculty member for the university's school of social work and he had worked in Vietnam with servicemen, as a parole officer and as a social worker.

As regards purpose of work, the counselors expressed strong sentiment that one of the most important things they did was to make their young clients feel good about themselves. Almost all identified the most common characteristic of this group as low self-esteem. They believed that by developing greater confidence the young people would be more ready to find and keep a job.

Despite this unanimity about the problem, counselors articulated two quite distinct approaches to helping young people build greater self-esteem. Some saw their primary tasks as talking to young people, listening to their problems, encouraging them and trying to give them a sense of direction and purpose. One counselor mentioned that she occasionally provided emergency counseling services to clients. Another in describing her job said, "I work with them to make them feel better about themselves...work on being their friend." She said that "with a light and soft approach," she encourages them to pursue their education and vocational kinds of things. Another commented that he wants kids with the highest needs to be stabilized and ready to make realistic decisions. He worries far less about the placement rate.

Another group saw themselves with a much more narrow, more sharply defined purpose. They felt that their emphasis should be only on teaching basic work

skills and habits and the skills needed to live an independent life. Once a client was considered job ready, the next task was to help them in job hunting by acting as a liaison with potential site placements. These counselors appeared to see their work as more directly assisting clients measure job performance against work goals and to help job site supervisors work in the same way. The group of counselors as a whole, however, believed they were working with young people who had significant personal problems that affected their ability to find and hold onto jobs. One counselor commented that he would like to see kids develop skills and attitudes that made them employable. And, he said, although he was not there to "shrink" the kids on the other hand the program had to be more than an income transfer program.

In describing the young people, as we have mentioned, the primary characteristic noted by counselors was low self-esteem. In addition, by definition, they needed money. In comparison to other people their age, more came from single parent families. This was particularly true of the refugee clients who often had come to this country without any family members. Most fell into the age range of 16-18 which represented an older population than had been true of WTP clients in the past. Quite a number were married and/or had children. The ones who were out of school were usually not living at home and often were heads of households (usually as a single parent) and were trying very hard to be independent. Often the young people were described as being real survivors, although most counselors also commented that the majority had few academic, work or life skills. All were having problems getting jobs which, in part, was consistent with the state and country's general economic condition. There was little evidence of adequate, developed support systems except, perhaps, in the case of the refugee group.

Several counselors mentioned that the young people on their caseloads were from rural areas, were not particularly sophisticated and often had no intent

of continuing in school (either finishing high school or postsecondary). There was a difference in level of motivation among clients but even the motivated ones did not necessarily have a strong sense of career direction or goals. Counselors felt they had few role models in terms of aspirations for careers. Few students in the school program were active in the school's extracurricular activities, in part because work schedules impinged on after school time. A tendency was noted to think in terms of filling immediate needs rather than focusing on long term goals In this regard the young people didn't appear too different from other teenagers. However, among most of the CETA-eligible group there was a considerable lack of realism and lack of understanding about the demands of the work world. One counselor commented on an inability to internalize advice and preparation materials.

Variation showed up, according to the counselors, in the attitudes and experiences of young people in regard to school. One counselor commented that the usual stereotype of CETA clients doing poorly in school was just not true. In his caseload, about half were doing well while the other half had real academic problems. Those doing well were highly motivated and a number were college-bound. He felt CETA-eligible young people ran the whole gamut. The range of attitudes toward education was considered the result of different backgrounds and the kinds of role models the young people had had. Among the out-of-school population, most of the young people did not want to talk to counselors about their school experiences. There was a general consensus that this group had serious deficiencies in terms of reading and writing skills.

Living situations also varied a good deal. Among in-school young people, some were in stable, though low-income homes, living with one or both parents. The greater number of both in-school and out-of-school clients, however, lived in unstable environments whether with family, friends, alone or as heads of households. Cases of abuse were not uncommon both with the young people being

abused and in the case of young single parents, acting as the abuser. The one central factor that appeared to affect the young person's emotional stability and ability to function well was the existence of a strong relationship with an adult. Although there were clear examples where clients were in need of money, food or support services, that fact in and of itself was probably not as significant as whether the young person had experienced a good relationship with an adult who had served as a role model.

This group of counselors provided interesting if sometimes differin, perceptions of the organization in which they worked. In interviews with key administrators before the cuts of summer 1981, it seemed clear that considerable attention was placed by management on the way the organization worked. There had been a very conscious effort to develop a set of devices to involve staff in planning and decisionmaking. When the staff had been larger, teams had been set up to meet regularly to discuss issues, both programmatic and those dealing with internal process. The administrative style as described by managers appeared to be consciously participatory rather than informally, almost casually, collegial as we had seen in other organizations.

As administrators began to recognize that substantial cuts were coming, they brought in the staff to help decide how the program should be changed. In 1980 they designed the Client Performance Objectives which gave staff the opportunity to help in development of program goals. Through the CPOs staff can formally assess the needs and goals for the clientele in general. Administrators felt that this early involvement of staff helped ease the trauma when the major cuts came.

Following the reduction in staff in summer 1981 there continued to be a strong sense of staff involvement. Counselors still met in their teams for planning purposes and to solve problems. Teams were broken down into "teamlets" that also met regularly to talk about workshops being planned or specific cases.

The involvement seemed to go beyond decisionmaking and was expressed in terms of personal support and relationship. Counselors described the relationships: "The other counselors on my team are a good support system"..."This is a very supportive place to be...the values and goals of my supervisors mirror my own." Another commented that mini-groups of four persons each had been started that met weekly as support groups.

The counselors we interviewed were just about evenly divided in their comments on the administrative environment created in the county's program. Those who appreciated the supportive atmosphere liked the fact that all the counselors were now working out of Smith Tower in downtown Seattle because it gave them an opportunity to work more closely together and provide support for each other. Others felt that too much collegial input was demanded, too much time was spent in meetings, that too much focus was placed on the group process of the staff itself. Some stated that there was a tremendous waste of counseling time in meetings. This group generally felt that the shift of counselors to the central downtown office was counterproductive, took the counselors out of the school and away from the community.

One counselor was diplomatic and took a middle ground. He said that he spent about five hours a week (minimum) inside the agency, tending to agency business. The number of hours often went way beyond this when plans were being drawn up for new programs such as VEPs. The time in the agency was spent in planning, troubleshooting, dealing with changes in the program and clarifying staff roles. He felt that created an exciting environment in which to work despite the decline in productivity. He admitted that a lot of time was spent on talking rather than on delivering services but he believed that this was necessary to the internal working of the program. The time spent thus might be considered "a bit excessive," he commented, but certainly not wasted. Nearly all complained about the amount of time taken up by transportation. For some this amounted to five hours a week

out of a 35 hour work week.

In terms of contact with other adults, all the counselors commented on their working relationships with school district personnel. These included principals, career education staff, teachers in the regular program, special education and vocational education teachers and school counselors. One of the WTP counselors who was involved with the Let's Work Together pilot project had an office at Renton Vocational Technical Institute and worked closely with that staff. There was apparently no contact with other CETA-funded programs such as those operated by the Seattle School District or the City of Seattle except at the higher administrative levels. We found that the delivery level staff had very little knowledge of those other programs, their populations or their responses to funding reductions.

Direct supervision for the counselors was provided by two service supervisors. There were other levels of management in the organization -- in fact, of the 26 staff members, only the 13 counselors and the lone trainer left in the program worked directly with young people. The remaining staff were either supervisory, involved in management information, budget and payroll or clerical work. Just as there was a split among counselors in regard to the general environment of the office, some of the staff appreciated the supportive approach of the supervisors. The two supervisors, whose responsibilities were divided on a geographic basis, met at least once a week on an individual basis with each supervisee in addition to the team and teamlet meetings. In individual and group sessions, discussion centered on caseload management issues such as treatment of particular clients, problem-solving, stress, paperwork technicalities, the results of cutbacks and program changes. One counselor mentioned that she particularly appreciated being able to seek out her supervisor for advice although, with the cuts, supervisors had more responsibilities and less time for individual assistance.

Other counselors, however, commented that perhaps there were problems with over-supervision. As one person said, any counselor who had survived two RIFs

doesn't need much supervision. In fact, he felt he could do his job without any supervision. As we mentioned earlier, all the staff who remained had been with the program for a minimum of four years. Generally speaking, however, all the counselors interviewed felt they had considerable discretion when they were actually on their job, working with young people and monitoring job sites. Changes in funding levels and in the program had cut discretion in certain areas. The shift toward developing private sector, unsubsidized jobs was seen as producing considerable constraints on staff in terms of client mix and actual services provided to young people.

Evaluation of staff was formal and followed the process developed for all county staff. It was carried out two times a year and was based on standardized criteria. The process that was used involved both evaluator and employee writing up their perceptions of what the person had accomplished with a format that resembled a job description. They compared notes and the supervisor usually revised and edited comments to come up with a final product that would be signed by both. According to one counselor, 95 percent of the final evaluation was based on attitude (participation in meetings, etc.) and performance on paperwork. He added that the supervisor never saw the counselor working with students. Another pointed out that although there were meetings between counselors and supervisors in the central office, her supervisor had only been out to visit her once in the field. Although a number did not feel that evaluations were very useful to them in improving their job performance, most counselors believed that there was a general congruence between their understanding of the job and that of their supervisor.

King County

3. Young People's Perceptions and Experiences

Of the young people we interviewed, approximately one-third had dropped out of school before graduation. The others were still in school or had graduated. The youngest was 16 and the oldest, a Southeast Asian refugee, was 21. They lived with a variety of people including single parents (usually the mother), foster parents, friends or in one case with a fiance. There were no Blacks in the sample but several Asians. Most of the interviews were conducted on job sites, either public sector or in two cases OJT sites. The students generally had had more experience with vocational education classes in high school than was true of either the Seattle Public Schools or the City programs. In most cases the vocational classes were in typing and business machines.

In terms of future education, it appeared as though aspirations were not as high, in some cases unrealistically so, as had been observed in the Seattle programs. Only one student, a junior in high school, indicated an interest in graduate school or a profession (law). The others either said they would not go on for further education -- one Asian girl said that there were 11 people in her family and she had to work to help support them -- or if they did it would be to community college or a vocational school. The preparation most frequently mentioned was in data processing or computer work. One Asian who had completed his junior year but was currently out of school said that he planned to return to school at some point to better his English. Plans for further education were relatively modest and realistic and may well reflect the preparation they have received in high school, particularly through a more developed set of vocational options.

Perceptions about their friends and schooling was mixed, about evenly divided between those who liked school and those who didn't. Comments included reports that friends "liked school somewhat because of the social life" and "yes, they liked school as much as anyone does." Among adults who have been helpful to the young people, a few said "no one" very definitely but most responded that either particular teachers or their counselors (including work training) had helped them most. A couple mentioned family friends and one indicated that a nurse in the hospital had "kept him company" during a long recovery from a motorcycle accident.

In terms of finding a job, again there was a mixed response. Some young people felt they had met no adult in school who could help them if they were looking for a job while the rest mentioned the work training counselor, teachers or in one case a principal who was a personal friend. An interesting note to this is the fact that virtually all of the young people felt that most of the adults they had known in school cared whether they succeeded or failed. There was disagreement over the question of whether later success is related to performance in school. About half felt how well they did in later life was little affected by how well they did in school. Again, there was general agreement that success in school depended on how hard one tried but disagreement on the relation between length of time in school and the amount of money a person would make. One person "totally" disagreed with that idea.

Most of the work experience the young people reported had come as a result of the CETA program with special emphasis on OJT jobs. These work training program jobs ranged from office work of various kinds to building kitchen cabinets to custodial work. A number of young people had worked in day care centers, libraries and in jobs as clerks and cashiers. Other non-CETA jobs were primarily farm work or fast food positions and had been found with the help of family members or friends. Money was the first response in reasons for liking a job in

only a few cases. The much more common answer involved the people (both co-workers or customers). One girl commented that the thing she liked most about her job was that the people she works with have accepted her. Another said there was always something to do and several mentioned there were new experiences and new things to learn on the job. Among things the young people did not like about their jobs were logistical issues such as being too far from someone's house or being in too quiet a setting. One person said she felt out of place in the job because of her poor typing skills.

The most common response, however, was "nothing." With this group of young people there seemed to be a high rate of astisfaction with their current jobs or the one most recently held. A couple mentioned that they would like to stay on their present job and several mentioned jobs within the same organization they would like to acquire. One girl said she would like to stay where she is because she "feels really comfortable here and is scared about changing jobs." Another mentioned that he would like to continue working with the furniture company but would like to do more complicated craftsmanship. In thinking of jobs they might like to have right now, several mentioned the jobs they were doing with perhaps some advancement in terms of skill level. When asked why they would choose a particular job, the answers were generally very practical: "automechanic -- I like to work with my hands," "cabinetmaking -- it is creative and I like to work with my hands," "radio station engineer trainee -- I like working with radios and I like music." One named a job in data processing as the job she wanted because it is "future-oriented."

When asked what they would do first if looking for a job, those who were still in school indicated they would talk to the work training counselor, check the newspapers and contact friends. One said the first thing she would do was "panic -- then look in newspapers, talk to the career counselor at school and put in applications." Among those who had graduated from high school, a couple

said they would check back with the work training counselor but generally the first response was to look in the newspapers, check with friends, or go through the employment agency. The same was true for those who had dropped out of school.

Friends of the young people interviewed were evenly divided in terms of working and not working. Most felt their friends would like to be working if they were not but of those working, almost were reported as not liking their jobs. Again, the young people were evenly divided over whether money was the main reason for working. They all agreed that doing good work makes a difference in getting better jobs. Butonly one of the group believed that if someone lost a job, it was their own fault. The respondents generally agreed that it is important to be happy in one's work and that work would be an important part of their lives. A number of the young people commented that they wanted to work because work made them feel more independent and grown up. One said she wished she had a job because "it's boring sitting around." Another, in commenting on her experiences in the work training program indicated that they had been extremely helpful to her in learning about a field -- law -- that she would otherwise not have encountered.

Clark County

Clark County occupies a difficult position in the southwest corner of the state of Washington. Its resident economy is largely dependent on the lumber industry with several large pulp and paper mills within the county. Agriculture is another primary source of income for county residents. Vancouver is the county seat and the largest community with 42,834 people out of a total county population of 195,286. Minority representation in the county is small — approximately five percent — with a limited number of Southeast Asians migrating to the area. The area's economy has been hard hit by the national and state recessions because of its major dependency on lumber and related industries. There has been some growth in the electronic field in both Vancouver and Portland.

Another factor in the area's economic situation relates to its border position with Oregon. County businesses suffer from the differences in the taxation systems of the two states. Washington residents pay no income taxes, have relatively low property taxes but pay a heavy sales tax on all items including food. Oregon residents pay higher property tax and their incomes are taxed but they have no sales tax. Two new bridges cross the dividing Columbia, encouraging interstate movement. Washington residents buy in Oregon but, increasingly, people are moving to Clark County to take advantage of the easy commute to the large Portland metropolitan area. This means there has been a noticeable growth in the number of school age children north of the river and Clark County's seven school districts, particularly

those near the river, have experienced enrollment increases. New schools are being built and a new vocational skills center has just been completed (1983) to serve all school districts except Vancouver, which refused to participate in a consortium effort.

However, aside from Vancouver and Camas (location of the area's largest pulp mill), and the riverside suburban communities (home for either Vancouver or Portland commuters), the rest of the county is primarily rural with small school districts or consolidated high schools. Placement of young people in the private sector has been particularly difficult, not only in the rural areas where there are limited opportunities, but also in the larger communities because of the high unemployment rates and generally poor economic situation. The year of our interviews was the first time that the county's CETA office had not administered a subsidized work experience program as such for young people and instead was focusing on private sector job development. Some OJT and Vocational Exploration Programs (VEPs) were being operated.

At the time of our interviews, CETA-funded programs in the Vancouver area were administered by the Clark County Department of Human Services. Just prior to that period, county government had gone through a series of reorganizations but despite name changes it was possible to track the course of CETA administrative and programmatic changes. The prime sponsor throughout its existence had reported to the Clark county Board of Commissioners.

In the early years of the program, the county office had actually operated a number of programs including work experience and OJT with a requirement that Clark Community College be involved with the GED component. However, by 1981-82, the county had gradually moved from providing direct services to contracting out all their programs. The in-school program was run by the Educational Service District (ESD), the out-of-school program was handled entirely by the community college and the adult programs were shared

by the college and a number of community-based organizations.

Before describing the various components of the youth program that we observed in Clark County, it will be useful to look at the approach taken by county administrators as they developed what they felt was an appropriate programmatic and funding strategy for job development and training in the region. Most of the administrative staff we talked with had been involved in the planning for cutbacks that had started several years before cuts came, anticipating the growing instability of the federal dollars and their categorical delivery. In discussions with a former head of Clark County's CETA programs, it became clear that there had been a conscious institutional effort to avoid continuing reliance on federal funds for employment and training. A part of this effort was the county's gradual transition from in-house activities to contracting out.

Over the last several years, program administrators had involved a planning council in thinking through program and funding options. The program had originally been divided into the three areas of service: in-school, out-of-school, and general adult programs, with the county providing most of the services directly. Anticipating federal cuts early on, the administrators had developed and carried out an extensive needs assessment that gathered data on who their clients were, focusing particularly on the differences between the in-school and out-of-school populations. Among other things, they found most in-school clients had other means of support while out-of-school young people were often heads of households or generally without other means of support.

Once the available data had drawn a kind of profile of the in-school and out-of-school groups, county administrators brought together an ad hoc, community-based planning council. This group, composed of people from other institutions such as schools, courts and juvenile agencies, helped in the

analysis of the data, commenting and advising on the design of overall youth programs. They were told at this stage not to worry about where the dollars were coming from (by source or title), but instead to concentrate on what they felt would constitute a good program for a variety of young people. During this process, the planning council assumed substantial ownership in the program. In addition, they became an informal negotiating body for competitive interests and for important, difficult programmatic and funding decisions.

Following the identification of the population groups and appropriate activities for them, the planning group faced the funding issue directly. At that point, both Title IIb and Title IV funds were available but there was growing uncertainty about the future of Title IV. The planners lined up different activities with the known Title IIb resources and developed a ranking to allow them to continue the most critical programs if Title IV funds were indeed cut off. The county was able to maintain considerable flexibility in looking at its entire pot of employment and training dollars, including the adult programs, so they could meet what they had judged as priority needs. This flexibility was shown when the county found they were going to receive YETP dollars and immediately plugged them into the in-school program releasing the committed Title IIb dollars to promote additional training for adults. With this approach, administrators felt they could most productively use whatever federal resources were available to meet the overall employment needs of the county.

Assuming the uncertainty of federal assistance, county staff had consistently tried to protect essential programs from the whims of categorical funding. With the strong base of support developed during the planning process described above, they developed means to leverage the existing CETA dollars.

Over time, the cooperating institutions were being asked to bring their own resources and add them to the pot in order to expand the total capacity to provide employment services. The out-of-school program which had originally been operated by the county was now shifted substantially into the community college. At the time of our interviews, Clark Community College was not only serving as the contractual agent to deliver the service, but they had agreed to contribute the cost of the program administrator and the services of a college dean responsible for overseeing all CETA programs in which the college participated.

A similar arrangement was developed for the in-school program. The county had operated a program of work experience and OJT in the area's high schools. As funding reductions became real, the CETA administrators worked with the Educational Service District to develop a program that the EDS would run in the high schools and to which it would also contribute resources. In addition, the individual districts made financial commitments to the program. For instance, in the first year of this shared effort, the various school districts within the ESD came up with $75-90,000 of funds to match the CETA monies. We will discuss the contributions in both the in-school and out-of-school efforts later in the paper.

The intent of the county staff was to build a program capable of leveraging sufficient resources to continue even if CETA ceased to exist. In addition to direct contributions of dollars and in-kind services, they worked with the key actors in other institutions to adapt their programs to the overall manpower training needs, developing new strategies and dropping old ones that didn't work. As described by the primary participants, county staff had three major goals: maintaining the integrity and viability of their programs; leveraging other institutional resources; and, in what was termed by the interviewee as a kind of "grandiose" effort, they tried to bring about

institutional change. This individual had left Clark County the year before our interview. He had left behind a group of people well-schooled in the planning process described above. He felt that Clark County, in contradistinction to many other CETA agencies, was going to have a good year just because of its anticipatory approach.

1. Structure and Operations

While Clark County moved to a system where all youth programs were contracted out, it continued to operate a number of the adult training programs. They found this to be more economical because of the program's small size. The total number of dollars available and training recipients were not sufficient to attract the attention of the major community-based organizations which are traditional providers of CETA-funded services. At one time the Opportunities Industrialization Center which is based in Portland had established a branch office in Vancouver but internal problems forced cutbacks and the county discontinued contracting with them. In addition, there are problems in contracting across state boundaries so that opportunities to work with organizations such as the Portland Urban League are limited. Maximum use has been made of Clark Community College's vocational education facilities to the point that the college operation had to be operated in shifts. At its highest level, Clark County's CETA budget was $4 million but in 1981-82 that budget had been pared down to $1.7 million.

Clark County In-School Program

Seven school districts fall within the service area of Educational Service District 112. Each of the ten high schools in the ESD has a career counselor. Some of these career specialists perform other functions in their schools such as special education, vocational education, etc. In addition, some of these school district staff are not funded by CETA. Individual districts have retained the discretion to use CETA monies as they chose. In some cases, money provided by the prime sponsor was used for materials and equipment. Existing personnel were used for the CETA functions simply by shifting or expanding

responsibilities. For instance, in the Evergreen school district, special education counselors were already providing job preparation and developing work sites for young people and CETA dollars were used to generate more resources for student wages.

The year before we carried out our interviews, the CETA in-school program had been primarily work experience in public sector placements. This effort had been mounted jointly by the ESD and the prime sponsor with Clark County personnel running certain programs such as those in the state school for the deaf and the blind. (These special programs were eliminated during budget cuts although some staff people still expressed optimism that they would eventually be reinstated.) At this time, many of the career specialists in the high schools who were involved with job preparation and work experience had extended their services to the total youth population.

An issue that became clear in the pre-cut planning process described earlier was a certain level of distrust between the prime sponsor and the school districts. In an attempt to remedy this situation, the prime sponsor involved the school districts extensively in the youth facet of county planning. The final design that came from this process named the ESD as the administering body rather than the county believing that ESD staff would be more acceptable to the districts than the prime sponsor staff. The original design envisioned different kinds of activities in the different school districts. Two committees made up of school district personnel came up with a multi-faceted program they considered optimal but in the final stages of planning, the bottom fell out in terms of funding. It was the Title IV dollars that appeared the most in danger and planners began to look increasingly toward the use of Title IIb funds recognizing that the regulations for this category would change the substance of the program markedly.

In the program readjustment, the work experience emphasis was changed to

a rotation or job exploration approach which called for placements that could provide a maximum of 40 hours at each job task. This Vocational Exploration Program (VEP) had been piloted in the district the year before but only one school had chosen to try it. Students involved in the Vocational Exploration Programs were given a stipend for their work which administrators differentiated from a job subsidy. Clark County's Department of Human Services made the decision to change the focus of the program believing that vocational exploration increased the possibilities for private sector placements. The subsidized jobs in the earlier years had been in the public sector but the danger that all youth programs would have to operate under Title IIb regulations have added impetus to the development of private sector sites.

In addition to the change from work experience to VEPs, districts found that program auditors had questioned the use of CETA-funded counselors providing services for young people who were not CETA-eligible. At the time we interviewed in the schools, counselors were responsible for recruitment of students, assessing individual needs, working on job preparation and search skills, job development and monitoring.

Each district had a fair amount of discretion in terms of relating the CETA-funded programs to other programs. Although the Educational Service District did not have any involvement with monies earmarked for vocational education, in some of the participating districts there had been cooperative efforts between the CETA program people and those in vocational education in setting up career programs and in some cases combined use of equipment. In one district, for example, vocational education money was used to buy an Apple computer career game that was also used by CETA-eligible young people. Voc ed personnel took an active role in helping to design the ESD youth employment programming.

The ESD in-school program had seven CETA-funded positions but there were

eleven people altogether affiliated with the program. The supervisor served half-time as coordinator of the ESD program and half-time as a career specialist in one of the high schools. The year before, she had been a full-time career specialist. When we talked to the supervisor there was a projection of 90-100 students enrolled but the actual present enrollment at the time was 50. However, the administrator did not know how large the potential population of eligible young people was. Eligibility was determined on the basis of free and reduced lunch participation. Allocation of dollars was driven by school size.

Students in most of the high schools did not just walk into the door of the program; they had to be recruited. This was, in part, according to the administrator, because of the stigma attached to CETA. Poverty level teenagers considered participation in the CETA program as a personal liability so their tendency was to become passive and not seek out program (and, therefore, employment) opportunities. The administrator felt there was a kind of apathy on the part of students because they had learned through observation that they could get by. There seems to have been little consideration given to the effect of the close identification of the CETA program with special education activities. In several schools the programs were run out of the same office, often by the same staff members.

Program characteristics varied school to school particularly because the individual districts had substantial discretion in the use of their CETA monies. Prior to job placements, career specialists worked with students one-to-one or in groups to carry out needs assessments, and to work on job preparation and search skills. Counselors prepared an employability development plan for each student. Variations in program came as a result of differences in school populations, of district resource decisions, and of the other roles performed by counselors in their schools.

However, all schools had changed from subsidized work experience in the public sector to the Vocational Exploration Program which included placement in the private sector. In the eyes of administrators, students in the work experience program had been under the supervision of a public sector manager while working on a job. The shift to VEPs was seen as an opportunity for students to see themselves as receiving training in job skills and attitudes rather than merely earning dollars. In fact, they were now given a "stipend" while working rather than earning wages and the amount they received was less than under the work experience provisions. Under the new system they worked 10 hours a week at $3.00 an hour rather than minimum wage.

When the career specialist was developing a job site, he or she asked the employer to provide different tasks for the students to fulfill the requirement of 40 hours at one job activity. (Students could stay on the same site for one year as long as the focus of the tasks changed.) The idea of the VEPs was that the job would be broken down into component parts in order to provide the student with additional information in career searching. The work supervisor was supposed to give the student a good sense of those individual job components and the relationship of one to another. More was required of the VEP supervisor than was true of the supervisor in the public sector subsidized job program. Local chambers of commerce were involved in the development of the VEPs by providing lists of employers who would be willing to take students under these arrangements. They also helped in the development of a job shadowing program and came to schools to talk to students about career options.

Districts also had discretion to decide whether students got credit for their work experiences. The Vancouver district did not allow credits but other districts felt that the schools could use work credit and grades as an incentive for students. In Vancouver, working was seen as an activity in addi-

tion to the school day while in other districts it was considered part of the regular school program.

Some of the program personnel felt that the program should be set up as a work-study approach which would help integrate work and school. The previous year's program, as mentioned earlier, had provided transitional services in the schools to all students, including the CETA-eligible group. Five hours were provided in class for all students on choosing a career. This was followed by a second phase where students came into the high school's career center for additional help and information. In the 1981-82 school year (during our interviewing), the ESD told their counselors they could work only with the CETA population as a result of program monitoring. Therefore, with the introduction of the VEPs and the concentration on the CETA young people, many students received no career education. The districts had received a strong message from the federal government that if career education was important, the districts should pick up that activity and not try to spread CETA funds in order to meet the needs of all students.

It was interesting to note that CETA was a relatively new program in a number of districts, particularly in some of the rural areas. In one of the larger, faster growing districts, however, the counselor reported that up until two years before that time (1981), the high school had chosen not to use CETA dollars. In that instance, the school had always had a large work experience program for special education students. This meant that some of the functions were not necessarily new when the CETA program was added on, particularly the job development and placement portion. In fact, for many of the counselors the more demanding activity was complying with the paper work requirements because this was an unfamiliar task which had to be added to their repertoire. Their tendency was to take the requirements seriously, causing them to spend a higher proportion of their time filling out forms

than would be true of their counterparts in other locations where familiarity often has bred comtempt for federal regulations.

2. Delivery-Level Perceptions, Problems, and Working Relations

In talking to the career counselors in the ten high schools of ESD 112, the most striking common feature was the close relationship between the CETA-funded positions and special education activities. Virtually all of the counselors were carrying out functions directly connected with special education programs in the schools and most had been serving in that capacity before they picked up the CETA tasks. As mentioned before, the two programs often operated out of the same office and, in some cases, vocational education programs also shared space.

A much higher percentage of the students participating in the CETA program in Clark County were special education students than was true in the other sites we visited. In some schools, all CETA students were classified as special education. It was difficult to discover whether counselors merely continued to work with their same pre-CETA population, or whether only those students classified as special ed could be recruited into the program. Some CETA counselors also served as vocational education advisers. Two counselors had merely added on the CETA students to their regular special education caseload with no additional compensation. In that district, the CETA funds had been used to hire a person who did nothing but intake, handling paperwork and eligibility checks for the two high schools in the district.

In all cases there was a close integration of the CETA staff person into the rest of the school both personally and programmatically. A number of counselors commented specifically that they were considered part of regular school activities because of their other roles and inspite of their CETA connection. In fact, one counselor noted that the CETA "stigma" extended to staff as well as students; there is certainly no status attached to the program. (It would be interesting to know whether the rather unsavory reputation of Portland's

CETA program which was ultimately eliminated because of fiscal wrongdoing played a part in the general perception of CETA.)

As to individual counselors, a number had academic credentials and background in special education or vocational education. Only one had had specific CETA experience before joining the ESD program. Of the group, half were young teachers with two or three years experience who found themselves laden down with heavy and varied work loads although in no case was the CETA function itself onerous. Caseloads of CETA students were as low as six in some districts. A common mix of activities was intake and job development for CETA students, coordinating the school's career center, teaching career education courses, and possibly involvement of various degrees in the vocational education program. Most counselors worked individually with students although there was a certain amount of group work, particularly in the larger schools where job preparation skills were taught through workshops.

Motivations in their work covered a range from making young people job ready to assisting young people in self-discovery and enhancing their chances of making it in life. One indicated that behavior modification and academic achievement constituted the purpose of his work. There was a general sense that the young people they dealt with were all in need of support and attention.

When counselors discussed this CETA-eligible population, certain characteristics were commonly mentioned. There was some variation that appeared to be related to an urban/suburban vs. a rural environment. Some of the young people had self-confidence and a vision of what they wanted to do in the future. Several counselors said that the students did not deal well with frustration, however, and tended to "act out." Others pointed to a kind of apathy which reflected the student's uncertainty about the power to influence the direction of his or her own life. In most cases, there was a history of failures

and an unfulfilled need for outside support and reinforcement.

Few of the young people were aware of opportunities that were available to them in the community or in the high school to help them in developing job preparation skills and getting jobs. knowledge of critical work habits and attitudes was generally low. It is important to emphasize again that many of the students under discussion were special education students who had been judged either mildly retarded or suffering from a specific learning disability. The aspiration level was not high for most of the students -- most knew they would work some day and many assumed they would work with their hands. There were few illusions about going on to college and in fact most of them were characterized as feeling threatened by traditional academic materials and work.

Interesting differences showed up in comparing rural students with those from the urban and suburban areas close to Vancouver. The city students were seen as being more competitive and "fast-paced" while the rural young people were considered more apathetic and passive. These observations coincided with our interviews in the King County program. (Some comparison was possible because a number of counselors worked in different high schools within the district drawing on different resident populations.) One counselor pointed to the strong moral and religious pressure in some of the smaller communities and the effect this had on young people. An interesting connection might be made between the moral values of independence and self-reliance and attitudes toward government assistance programs. Although poverty is not a new phenomenon in the area, seeking government help through the CETA program may well have been an unfamiliar and unpleasant response for many people. The difficulty counselors found in recruiting young people for the program may be related to these attitudes.

Counselors had different perceptions about attendance and student attitudes toward schooling. Some reported two basic kinds of students. Those who had found a niche somewhere in the school (usually in the vocational education area) and those who hated it and could hardly wait to get out. Other counselors indicated that most of their students liked school and had indicated an interest in going on to college. The nature of the particular school population appeared to play a role in these differences. The presence of a high percentage of special ed students would make a difference as would the historical approach to students with student needs. Schools that had tried to respond to individual needs and had not just shunted handicapped or economically disadvantaged students into isolated programs probably found those populations responding in a more positive way toward their educational experiences.

By definition, the target population came from low income families and in the urban/suburban areas there was a high percentage of students from single parent families. In some of the more affluent schools, there appeared to be a connection with the use of drugs and alcohol although the counselors were not sure on what scale their clients differed from the rest of the student population. The most commonly mentioned problems faced by young people revolved around family disruption of various kinds including separation and divorce, alcoholism, and sudden loss of jobs. Some young people were running into problems in school and in terms of job placement because they were having to pick up the role of primary caretakers of younger children in the family.

It was interesting to note that only two counselors specifically pointed to the need to adjust their approaches and responses to the varying needs of young people. This appeared in part due to the youth and relative inexperience of several of the counselors. One counselor who worked in an alternative high school program was clearly aware of the different needs of her students par-

tially because they had come into this program due to an inability to operate within the regular school program. She had only three students who were CETA-eligible but found that she treated them more carefully, more "tenderly" than other alternative students. She believed that the CETA young people felt inferior and timid. While the alternative students might feel the same way they had a tendency to throw their weight around. Generally speaking, many of the alternative group came from relatively affluent homes and had at least the external trappings of confidence.

In organizational terms, the counselors see themselves as related most directly to other members of their high school staffs. Not one person interviewed perceived himself or herself as a part of a CETA staff. As we have mentioned before, there was variability as to the source of dollars used to hire different counselors. In addition, in all cases their clients were a mixed group usually with CETA-eligible students in the minority. Their degree of identification with their "organization" was almost entirely dependent on the set of relationships developed within the particular school setting. There was interaction among counselors in different schools and often they would help one another in job placements outside their own geographic area. However, this appeared related to the high school units rather than in their role as part of a larger CETA organization.

For the most part, the counselors appeared quite positive about their relationships within their own schools. They turned to other school counselors, teachers (especially of vocational education), and principals for assistance and support. They appeared generally to be an integral part of their school environment. This varied to a degree but usually the reason for a certain sense of alienation had more to do with newness to the school community or to a particular individual. One counselor commented that she felt a number

of principals did not want career and vocational education in the schools. With emphasis on a "back to basics" academic approach, this group had tried to discourage strengthening of the vocational side of the spectrum. A survey had been done in the spring of 1981 that showed that students felt a great need for increased career and vocational skills. One principal's response was that the school "should tell the kids what they need, not vice versa." This counselor's concern was that the drop-out rate was going up and students were dropping out earlier and earlier in part because the schools were not meeting their needs.

All the counselors report to the administrator of the program who serves as a half-time coordinator and half-time career specialist. She meets with them frequently and there are regularly scheduled staff meetings twice a month. Generally, counselors felt the contacts were useful primarily as a source of information about changes in the program. They expressed the feeling, however, that they worked in a relatively independent fashion and within the framework of their own school regulations, had a fair amount of discretion. The coordinator goes through a formal evaluation process with the counselors which most felt was useful, particularly the younger counselors. However, some of the more experienced staff did not see the supervision as particularly useful since they felt no problems with implementing the program centered primarily on external factors. The most critical one was the state of the economy which made job development and placement very difficult. As several indicated, many employers would not even take on someone to shadow a job because so many adult workers had been laid off they feared a reaction to having a young person on the site. It might appear as though the student had taken work from adult. A number complained about what they considered excessive paperwork. They also commented on eligibility concerns as creating problems in bringing young

people into the program.

3. Young peoples' Perceptions and Experiences.

The majority of the studnets interviewed were special education students. They came from a variety of backgrounds and were not necessarily economically disadvantaged since that requirement did not apply to special ed students. One black and one Asian refugee was included in the group we interviewed. The general attitude toward school was positive and in most cases teachers or counselors at their high school provided them with help when they needed it. Almost all had had some vocational education courses in high school.

In terms of work experience, all the students had worked. In most cases their first job had come through the CETA subsidized work experience program. Both these jobs and the non-subsidized, private sector jobs were largely clerical, janitorial or in restaurants. There was a high consistency with the comments from students at our other sites in that the things they liked about their jobs had more to do with the socializing experience than with the opportunity to learn work skills or even to make money. In fact, a surprising number in the ESD group answered they disagreed with our statement that the main reason for working was to make money.

There was a relatively strong relationship between the kind of work they had done or saw themselves doing and the kind of education they felt they would need. Most did not see themselves going on to a four-year college (one exception was the Vietnamese student) but several thought they would take specific skill classes in the community college. There seemed to be a relatively strong tie to reality in their responses with very few broad aspirations expressed. On the whole they felt that in education and in their job searches they had received help from the adults in their lives. The CETA counselor was frequently mentioned as providing assistance of a personal nature as well as in efforts to find employment.

Out-of-School Program

1. Structure and Organization of the Clark County Out-of-School Program

The out-of-school CETA program is operated through Clark Community College which serves as the contractual agent. The county CETA office in the Department of Human Services does perform certain functions but at the time of our interviews, these were limited to intake and eligibility checks. This out-of-school program, funded by Title IIb, is intended for 16 to 21 year olds. It begins with a four week segment of intensive GED training, followed by four weeks of career information, job readiness training and job sampling. Following this second four week component, clients are moved into more intensive skill training programs operated by the college, into OJT slots or direct placement depending on their skill level and the availability of positions. Clients are usually in the program for about two months, and there is a series of staggered entry dates. At the time of our interviewing, there were about 20 young people enrolled in the out-of-school training.

The coordinator of the program was paid by Clark Community College but the program itself is funded through a CETA contract with the county. In addition to the IIB program, the community college also operates the Title VII program. This includes specific skill training in areas such as electronic assembly and wire welding. Originally this program was a skills effort funded by state vocational education dollars but at the time we talked to the coordinator, they were planning to switch to private sector training using teachers from local industry in some of the areas, particularly electronic assembly. Through the Private Industry Council, a certain commitment had been made by industry to hire these people after completion of training.

The Title VII programs demonstrate the high degree of cooperation between the public and private sector in the Vancouver-Portland area. The PIC first

assessed the manpower needs in the private sector and determined an appropriate number of people to be trained in specific skills. The PIC and industry representatives assisted in planning certain training curricula or screening applicants, and would sometimes make commitments to employ these clients following training. Of the people who had gone through the training, almost all had been placed in the designated skill area. Graduates of the out-of-school IIb component on occasion continued into the Title VII training program.

Throughout the process, there appeared to be strong and continuing contact among the various institutions that were involved in the design, development and implementation of the out-of-school program. The county administrator set up a meeting once a month typing together the staff from Clark College, the ESD, his office, various alternative education groups, and the area's PIC representative in order to keep a regular check on what the total youth-related program was doing. Within the Clark College program, line staff had had substantial discretion and input into program planning and had assumed that responsibility because of their knowledge of a firm commitment to this process on the part of their superios. Throughout the system there appeared to be a clear understanding of the need for integrating the components' various functions. A pilot program had been started in April 1981, focused on developing a greater degree of coordination between the work experience program and pre-employment training for youth.

Following cuts in funding, the Clark College program had to push clients through a rapid sequence beginning with the intensive GED study, usually in periods of six weeks to two months. After the GED and job preparation work, the alternatives mentioned earlier -- intensive training, OJT slots, or direct placement -- were available for graduates. These Title IV cuts were accompanied by cuts in referral services. Vocational education dollars, although sometimes

intermixed in the ESD program, had not been used in the youth efforts run by the college. However, at the time we talked to administrators, it was assumed that some vocational education money was going to be used for the Title IIb clerical program. This is an example of the greater fiscal flexibility that Clark County exerted across traditional funding and program boundaries.

Despite the relatively well integrated nature of the out-of-school program, however, responsibility for job placement following completion appeared to have been diffuse. An informal network had grown up during between the PIC and the county personnel during the earlier planning efforts. This network was necessary in part because of the community college's understaffing in the area of job development. In addition, the Clark County program had been affected when the Portland CETA had folded due to pressure from bad press and charges of misuse of funds. A consortium had been formed which included Portland and some of its surrounding county areas. The PIC, however, had been reconstituted during this disruption to include Vancouver, Portland's Tri-County area, but not Portland itself. Located in Portland, the PIC was less powerful than it might have been and primarily provided a kind of job clearinghouse to take advantage of the larger geographic area in terms of placement possibilities.

In terms of population, the out-of-school program worked with young people who were mostly drop-outs. Many of the teenagers were heads of single-parent households and were on welfare. Staff speculated that cuts in welfare would drive many more of them to seek jobs but the likelihood of finding employment in the very depressed Vancouver area was small. One in-take worker said she thought many of the young people were living in a sub-culture. A few would enter alternative educational arrangements such as offered by Evergreen State College (in Olympia) but for many this would not be an option. She also indicated that it had been necessary during the year of our interviews to go out and seek enrollees

because negative publicity had convinced people in the Portland-Vancouver area that all CETA programs had been terminated. As mentioned before, cuts in spending had slowed down the in-take process and also the ability to refer young people to other kinds of services.

2. Delivery-Level Perceptions, Problems and Working Relations

We talked with staff at the county's Department of Human Services, the Executive Director of the PIC located in Portland, and the staff at the Community College. Within this latter group, we spoke to the program administrators, GED specialist and the job developer. Specific skills instructors were generally solicited from local industry and changed with availability and different program emphases. However, we did observe several class sessions and talked briefly to those instructors afterwards.

The three primary staff had varying backgrounds from education and counseling to biology and chemistry. Their working experiences had also been varied. One had spent six years working at a boy's reformatory and a state prison while another had spent her time since graduate school teaching "all grades" and working at a small community college (not Clark). The third had been in a medical school program but had taken a "temporary" job with the state of Washington that had lasted for five years.

The administrator divided her time about half and half between administering and teaching. Her work with young people was primarily in groups and did not represent the highly individualized instruction provided in the GED component. The GED specialist said that he worked "48 hours a day" individually with young people. During that time he assessed their needs and then taught basic skills in preparation for the GED. However, he worked with the students to develop skills that went beyond that level to help them in work or if they continued in the community college. The job developer said that almost 75 percent of his time

was spent talking to employers convincing them to buy into the program and doing paper work. The rest of the time he met with young people helping them to explore career possibilities. During the four or five sessions he has with each student, he feels he gets to know them and learns something about their capabilities. He gives them ideas about jobs and finds out how reliable they are and how able they will be to deal with problems of transportation and child care.

In describing the young people, staff had realitively common perceptions about similar characteristics. All were non-high school completers. They had poor school histories with consistent records of failure. Most had poor work histories (if they had any), not staying with jobs or making progress within them. Both in school and on jobs these young people have high absentee rates and at the same time they have an expectation of "quick results" without having put in very much effort. Boredom with both curriculum in schools and routines on jobs was frequent with little understanding of the relationship between what they were doing and certain results. "Smart mouths" were common with many young people experiencing disputes with either teachers or supervisors. They were unusually affected by peer pressure both in a school or work setting.

Among differences, there was a group of passive, relatively apathetic students who had little ability to envision a place for themselves in school or on a job. The degree of confidence varied and the conditions of the family history did as well, particularly in terms of economic status. Some of the young people had not come from poverty homes but had completely cut themselves off from their families. There was also a difference in terms of attitude according to age. The younger students had a higher absenteeism rate in the program than did the older students who appeared more serious and committed to completing the program. All had problems in terms of reading but there was a

was cut to six weeks because of funding reductions.) Classes started the first of each month so there was overlap among them making it possible to work with three groups at one time. Usually 17-18 out of the original 20 participants completed the course. Young people often came back to repeat the program especially those who were most difficult to place -- in fact some clients were termed "legendary" by staff members.

In terms of contact with others doing similar jobs, all indicated that they did not have much contact with people outside their own program. They did have contact with others at the college who were involved in different programs and with the people at the county offices. Within their own program, there was almost constant contact -- over lunch, after work, etc. Each time a new class came in, there was discussion about the young people, and their problems and needs, again on a continuing, informal basis. One person said that he wished there were more opportunities to talk to people in other organizations about ways of meeting the problems he faced but there was no mechanism, formal or informal, set up to do that. This connection also included the county person who was responsible for intake for the out-of-school program as well as the various instructors who were brought in to teach special courses.

Only the administrator, in commenting on her job activities, indicated that she spent more time than was useful on non-essential tasks. She felt the amount of paperwork was astounding -- "CETA must have a paperwork syndrome" -- with a large share of that effort unnecessary in her mind. It whould be pointed out that she had only been on the job for three months when we began interviewing her and so was new to CETA's reporting requirements. It is safe to say across the various sites that frustration with paperwork appeared to be closely related to the length of time one had worked in the organization or to the introduction of

new program requirements. In many of our interviews, the more experienced worker who had dealt with CETA in other forms, did not perceive paperwork as a crippling problem, in part because they had learned how to move through it rapidly and in part because they did not take it very seriously.

When discussing evaluation at the community college program, two of the staff were considered regular community college personnel and were evaluated according to that institution's standards. The third was supposed to be evaluated by the program supervisor but his comments indicated that in the entire time he worked for the program (under more than the present supervisor) he had yet to seen an evaluation form. Because of the size of the program and the fact that a number of the people working with young people were there temporarily as special course instructors, it was difficult to determine any particular pattern of supervision. The comment made was that the atmosphere was collegial and discussion (with feedback) constant so that supervision in some hierarchical sense was non-existent. The community college people as well as the county person said that they felt they had considerable discretion about how they did their job and as one person said, believed themselves to be "free will agents."

In talking about policies and their impact on the performance of tasks, it was primarily the administrator who had comments. She felt that the budget process made her job very difficult particularly the uncertainty as to funding levels and program continuity. She again pointed to the paperwork requirements with the constant addition or substitution of new forms. She also felt that the uncertainty over funding was sometimes communicated to young people and did not help them in trying to face their problems of instability. The person responsible for job placement did note that some of the requirements for OJT made placement more difficult and wished there were flexibility in waiving

some of those requirements. Each staff member commented on the terrible state of the area's economy and that this presented the overwhelming problem in their work with young people. As one person said: "If the economic situation continues as it is now, most of these kids will never have a chance. They have problems to begin with and no matter what we do to help them, they have to go out and compete in a very tight job market."

3. Young Peoples Perceptions and Experiences

The young people we talked to in the Clark County program were all out of school, most of them having left school sometime during the 10 or 11th grade. They were all Caucasian and were between 17 - 19 years old. (It is interesting to note in regard to their ages, that there was none who was 16 or below at least in part because state regulations will not allow anyone to enter a GED program if they are high school age without the written agreement of the principal at their last high school. The GED teacher who mentioned this said that this was a real problem because most young people did not feel they could go back to their schools after they had dropped out, and besides, many principals were loathe to sign because it removes that young person as a potential source of state funding.)

A number of the young people had moved from school to school but most of the movement was in the Vancouver-Portland area. Often they commented they had liked the school they had left better and were not happy when they started a new high school. There was a consistency among these young people in not being able to identify anyone in their high school who had been of help to them and pointed to this sense of isolation -- particularly after a move -- as a reason for dropping out. Every one was enthusiastic about his or her experience in the

Clark College program, particularly their contacts with the GED instructor. He apparently was tough but fair, giving them considerable individual attention and he helped them to see clearly the progress they were making as well as the importance of learning what he had to teach.

In terms of the future, all of the young people appeared very realistic. It was obvious that the state's economic depression, particularly in the Vancouver area had affected them. Many people they knew were out of work and although they had all worked at one time or another, they knew jobs were tough. They had come to the Clark County program in part because they had recognized the need for at least a GED as well as hoping they would be able to enter one of the skills training courses that were available to a limited number of graduates of the program. Only one had serious thoughts about post-secondary level beyond the AA level in the community college. The aspiration level for both further education and work was relatively limited because of the economic situation but also because many of these young people had grown up in rural communities in the Vancouver area where there had been minimal attention focused on education, particularly for the professions.

Their friends were in the same condition they were. Most were out of school, often by dropping out, most were not working but wanted to. The attitude toward school was one usually not of anger or hostility but instead many young people expressed a feeling of their own isolation from the institution, or their inadequacy in mastering the environment. Their attitudes toward work were positive -- they wanted to do more of it. The desire was to find a good, stable job where they could make some progress but again, the aspirations were somewhat limited. A few expressed alienation from school and work -- the ones the intake worker had discribed as a part of the youth sub-culture -- but the majority had

been out in the world for a while and were concerned with their inability to cope with what they found.

wide range represented (although all students were required to have a 6th grade level for entry into the program). Common to all students was a feeling of threat in coming back into a school setting where they had known failure and low self-esteem. The kinds of problems the young people faced when they entered the program usually involved relations with family, logistical dilemnas such as transportation and child care, and the need for money.

The county's intake person expressed some of the same perceptions of the young people she met as she screened them for entry into the program. She noted, however, that there had not been a lot of chance to screen lately because not many young people were applying for the program. Among those seeking entry, many lacked a strong sense of direction. She was quick to point out, however, that just the fact that they had self-selected themselves by applying indicated a certain sense of purpose and a desire to change their lives.

In talking about the purposes in their own work, community college staff stressed the need to help these young people build confidence and feelings of self-esteem. The young people often had ideas about work that weren't always realistic and trying to help them understand better the world of work was an important part of the college's function. The GED effort was seen as a strong, positive way to give the students a feeling of measurable accomplishment. It taught them the relationship between effort and a particular outcome that could prove essential in any job situation. The need for young people to appreciate the importance of setting goals and handling problems for themselves was emphasized by the staff. A couple commented that it was very easy for people working with these young people to be drawn into the personal life of the client and to get involved with his or her problems.

Caseloads for the Clark College staff were predetermined by the county. Twenty students started each eight-week session. (The length of the sessions

San Francisco

San Francisco is an important location for research on federal employment policy, first, because it has a reputation for strong city administration, second, because it has an ethnically diverse population, and third, because its ethnic diversity is represented in strong community organizations that assume major responsibility for grass-roots administration. These attributes make San Francisco a useful contrast to our other sites-- Seattle and Clark County. Seattle has neither the dominant city government involvement nor the community-based delivery system that San Francisco has. Clark County, while it has strong county government involvement, likewise does not have a community-based delivery system. At the operations level, San Francisco's youth employment delivery system is run primarily by community-based organizations reflecting ethnic divisions within the city, and only incidentally by local government organizations, like the public schools and community colleges.

Federally-funded employment programs in San Francisco were administered during the time of our research by the Mayor's Office of Employment and Training (MOET).[1] MOET was headed by a strong administrator, Eunice Elton, a 40-year veteran of state and local employment administration, whose reputation for experience, toughness and political savvy is legendary, both within and outside San Francisco. The distinctive features of central organization were threefold: First, Elton, the MOET Director, reported directly to the Mayor of the City, making the political accountability of federal employment programs immediate and direct. Second, MOET ran a centralized management information

---

[1] The background information in this section was taken from interviews with employment and training administrators in San Francisco and from a draft report on employment and training administration in the city entitled "CETA: San Francisco," authored by Garth Mangum, dated September 4, 1980.

system that kept track of the status of all clients served by federally-funded employment programs. Third, MOET contracted with the state Employment Development Department-- California's employment security agency-- to handle intake, screening, and eligibility functions in a central location. When clients entered the system through this central intake point, they were referred to programs in the communities. When clients were recruited by community organizations, as most were in the younth programs we studied, they were screened for eligibility at a central point. Fourth, the 36-member Employment and Training Council, composed of representatives of delivery agencies and communities within the city, was viewed by all local employment administrators as a pivotal political arena for resolving local policy and funding questions. The Council was effectively the place where major conflicts among competing ethnic groups and communities were adjudicated. And fifth, the responsiveness of MOET to the Mayor and the city/county Board of Supervisors was an article of faith. MOET staff held temporary civil service positions, without tenure, and were subject to discharge at the pleasure of the Mayor. Taken together, these characteristics meant that the ethnic diversity of the city determined the actual location and mix of services, while the strong political and administrative control at the center maintained routine functions.

The city's ethnic diversity is well-known. In 1980, Caucasians constituted about 49% of population, Hispanics about 20%, and Asians about 15%, and Blacks about 15%. Less well known by outsiders is the extent to which these ethnic differences are represented in well-defined communities with strong identities. The Chinese and Japanese populations are each concentrated in relatively small communities with distinctive centers of commerce and business and strong community organizations. The Hispanics and

Blacks, while less well organized internally, are likewise concentrated in relatively well-defined areas. The community organizations that have sprung up in these areas carry the distinctive ethinic character of their neighborhoods.

San Francisco's economy is composed primarily of white collar, service occupations. Of the roughly 500,000 people employed in the city and county in 1980, 68,000 were in retail trade, 83,000 were in finance, insurance, or real estate, 140,000 were in business or medical services, and 88,000 in government. By the most conservative estimates, then, more than 75% of San Francisco's employment are in professional and service occupations. This kind of economy is not hospitable to low-income, high risk youth.

The role of the public schools and community colleges in employment programs has been shaped by the ethnically-based organization of the city. Up to 1971, the San Francisco Unified School District was a Kindergarten through Grade 14 system, which included post-secondary education. After 1971, the community colleges split off, leaving the school system without a substantial portion of its vocational education capacity. The school system now runs one predominantly vocational high school, one school of business and commerce, and a half dozen or so alternative high school programs which focus in varying degrees on the school-work connection. In the meantime, the lion's share of city-wide vocational training has moved to the community colleges, much of it taking place in the San Francisco Skill Center, a multi-purpose training program, formerly operated with federal employment and training funds, now funded and run by the state community college system. The Skill Center explicitly defines its clientele as adults and its mission as preparation for specific occupations (licensed vocation nurse, psychiatric technician, secretary, business machine repairperson, etc.) While there is considerable movement between federally-funded employment training programs and the Skill

Center, that movement is initiated by individuals seeking vocational training or by community organizations seeking placements for clients. Hence, there is a rough division of labor in San Francisco between the school system which focuses mainly on general education, the federally-funded employment and training system which focuses mainly on prevocational, classroom training, work experience, and on-the-job training on a community-by-community basis, and the community college Skills Center which focuses on specific adult vocational programs. One must be careful, however, not to attribute any overall rationality to this division of labor, since it is the clients themselves and individual administrators who negotiate the boundaries between the various organizations. The public school and the community college systems differ significantly from the rest of the employment training system in that they cut across the city's ethnic communities; they often see themselves as operating at a distinct disadvantage in the competition for clients and funds because of the neighborhood-based nature of San Francisco politics. The Skill Center has overcome this disadvantage, to some degree, by allying itself with the Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood, a predominantly black, public housing neighborhood in the south of the city.

1. Structure and Operations of Youth Employment Programs

Funding for youth employment programs in San Francisco at the time of our fieldwork (1981-1982) operated under a Request for Proposal (RFP) system, which had the effect of maximizing both central political control and broad participation by community organizations. An RFP was issued by MOET in the spring of each year, giving MOET priorities for program mix (classroom training, work experience, on-the-job training, basic education, etc.) and for the ethnic mix of participants, along with a break-out of funding by CETA title and function. Organizations responded with proposals specifying the

ethnic mix of clients they intended to serve, the occupational categories targeted for training or work experience, their intended placement rate, and mix of program activities. These proposals were reviewed by MOET staff and forwarded to the MOET Director and Employment and Training Council, where the mix of organizations, clients, and activities was reviewed for political balance and consistency with aggregate objectives. The resulting package of proposals is then sent to the Mayor for approval. Participants at all levels of this system-- from community organizations to MOET staff-- attribute considerable influence to the MOET Director and the Employment and Training Council in determining the mix of organizations and activities. Most delivery-level administrators looked to the Council and its various subcommittees as the key arena where decisions on proportions of funding for the city's ethnic groups would be fought out. At the same time, community organizations exercised considerable discretion in determining the mix of clients and activities once they became part of the system. For example, MOET guidelines specified that all organizations should attempt to serve a broad distribution of clients by ethnic groups. But all the organizations in which we interviewed had, in fact, concentrated their efforts mainly, or exclusively, on one ethnic group. Asked to explain this disparity, most delivery-level administrators said that they simply promised in their proposals to recruit outside their communities for clients but never felt pressure to change their client mix.

At the time of our interviews San Francisco was undergoing severe reductions in federal employment and training support, as were all localities in our sample. Expenditures in 1979 were about $7.7 million for adult-focused employment training (CETA, Title II) and about $1.7 million for youth programs (CETA, Title IV). Beginning in 1980 funding for adult-focused employment

training began to drop precipitously, to less than $3 million in 1981, while youth programs continued to grow, to just over $2 million. Then in 1982, both categories of support took an effective cut of about 50%. The effects of these reductions were apparent in all the organizations in which we interviewed. MOET was in the process of adjusting its central staff downward; vacant offices and surplus office furniture were visible everywhere. Community organizations, depending on the their size and program mix, were either holding their budgets constant by soliciting funding from a non-governmental sources or reducing their programs substantially. These changes in funding were confounded with earlier efforts by MOET to tighten performance standards and monitoring for all its contracting organizations. Training activities were subject to evaluation on the basis of placement rates, costs per placement, and benefit-cost calculations based on estimated earnings for participants. The effect of reduced funding and increased emphasis on performance standards was to alter significantly the number and type of clients served by community organizations, as well as the type of programs they offered. Organizations were quite explicit that they were shifting away from hard-to-train clients and intensive service-oriented programs to relatively highly-motivated clients and short-term, intensive programs. Because our interviewing took place in the midst of these changes, the results of fiscal and programmatic shifts were difficult to track, but their existence was clear.

Our delivery-level interviews focused on a representative cross-section of six community organizations:

> Youth for Service-- located in the city's industrial area, associated with no specific residential neighborhood, but with a long record of serving mainly Black youth.
>
> The Buchanan YMCA-- serving the Western Addition, one of the city's largest predominantly Black neighborhoods.

OBECA/Arriba Juntos-- a predominantly Hispanic organization located in the Mission District, the city's main Hispanic neighborhood.

Chinatown Youth Center-- a predominantly Asian organization located near Chinatown.

PACT, Inc.-- an organization serving predominantly Black youth, with an emphasis on college preparation; running an employment internship program affiliated with two high schools but not with a specific neighborhood.

San Francisco Unified School District-- operating an in-school work experience program under contract with MOET, serving an ethnically diverse population in all the city's high schools.

Youth for Service has a 25-year history of educational, counseling and employment programs for delinquent and low-income youth. During our interviews the organization was running a Job Search project with MOET funding, supplemented by a basic skills program for participants without high school equivalency credentials, and a phototypsetting program with funding from the state CETA discretionary fund. Roughly two-thirds of the 145 participants in the Job Search project during 1980-81 were Black, less than one-tenth were Asian, and the remaining number were about equally divided between Causcasian and Hispanic. All participants were out of school. About half the places in the basic skills program were taken by Job Search participants, the other half by ex-offenders. The phototypsetting program was a pilot venture enrolling only about 15 students at the time of our interviews. This mix of programs reflected an emphasis on relatively short-term preparation for job placement. Participants in Job Search are given classroom training in career development, communication skills, and interviewing techniques, as well as extensive one-on-one counseling by the project's staff of four employment specialists plus a director. The program runs in cycles of three weeks.

The staff of the Job Search program noted two recent abrupt changes in the program. One was the elimination of stipends for participants. Prior to fall of 1981, participants were given stipends equal to the minimum wage for the time they spent in the program. With the reduction in federal funding, stipends were eliminated. The second change was a shift in the number and type of participants. When stipends were offered, there were about 25 participants for each three-week cycle. After the elimination of stipends participation dropped to about 12 per cycle. And, in the words of one staff member, "the skill levels of participants have declined dramatically; we're getting cast-offs from the city school system and they are very poorly prepared for job search." Responses of Youth for Service staff to these changes were guarded. They planned to increase recruitment efforts, but were reluctant to make major changes in the program in light of the uncertainty of future federal funding; their time horizon did not extend beyond the spring of 1982, when funding decisions would be made for the following year.

The Buchanan YMCA is an important fixture of the Western Addition and its director, Yori Wada, is a prominent actor in San Francisco youth programs. The Buchanan Y is neighborhood gathering place for the predominantly Black youth of the Western Addition. It runs a NOET-funded work experience program for in-school youth, in addition to the usual recreational and youth development programs of a YMCA. The Career Employment Experience Program consisted, at the time of our interviews, of both subsidized and unsubsidized job placements for 17 in-school youth, coupled with a series of four career-oriented one-day workshops, spaced over the school year, and regular visits to students at the job site. The staff consisted of one full-time administrator, a former participant in the program, and part-time clerical assistance from current program participants.

OBECA/Ariba Juntos has been running bilingual, developmental disabilities and employment and training programs in the Mission District for 18 years. Virtually all participants are Hispanic, but they vary considerably by country of origin, with the majority coming from Mexico and a substantial minority from Central America, often as political refugees. The organization made its mark in the community largely through its remedial and on-the-job taining programs for adults and youth. Until the fall of 1981, OBECA ran an extensive diagnostic program for potential participants, a 12-week remedial course focused on preparing students to pass the GED, and a program of 8-12-week subsidized on-the-job training programs. At the time of our interviews, the organization was running an in-school work-experience program for youth, financed by the state CETA funds. Its remedial and on-the-job training programs were funded through MOET at the local level. In the transition from 1980-81 to 1981-82, OBECA's total budget dropped from $1 million to $660,000. Reductions in funding were reflected in reductions in staff, fewer clients, reduction of stipends for work-experience students, and elimination of intake screening for new clients. The Work Experience program, which was the major focus of our interviewing, consisted of about 21 students, who attended school in the morning and career development classes at OBECA in the afternoon until they were prepared to enter the labor force. After that, OBECA secured unsubsidized employment for students-- half in public, non-profit agencies, half in private firms-- or, for a few students, subsidized on-the-job training. "For most of our clients," a staffmember said, "these jobs are looked upon as permanent work. These are very needy people." The major effect of reduced funding that the staff observed was a decline in the number of applicants and an increase in difficult-to-train applicants.

The Chinatown Youth Center is a multi-purpose agency which has offered counseling, drug prevention, recreation, and employment services primarily to the Chinese community since 1970. At the time of our interviews the Center was running a subsidized work experience program for 35 in-school youth. About half the young people in the program spoke English, the majority were US-born, but a substantial minority were recent immigrants from Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Southeast Asia. The program consisted of part-time work, counseling, and supervision on the job site. The program was staffed by three counselors and a part-time administrator. The work experience program was a recent addition to the Center's activities, so the Center did not perceive itself as undergoing the same funding reductions as other organizations in our sample. The Center received a substantial proportion of its funding for non-employment services from private sources, mainly United Way. Another important difference between the Center and other organizations we studied was the high demand for positions in its employment program. While other programs were experiencing a slump in demand, the Center had nearly 200 applicants for its 35 positions.

PACT, Inc. has been in existence since 1962 as a minority education and job placement organization dealing mainly with the black community. Its most prominent youth-oriented program, prior to entering the youth employment field, was a minority talent search project, designed to recruit minority students for college. This program entailed sending counselors to all city high schools to talk to low-income, minority students and encourage them to apply to college. This relationship with minority students and high schools drew the organization into a youth employment project. PACT was funded in 1981-82 to develop and administer a career internship program for potential high school dropouts in small businesses. The project was funded by the local Private Industry Council (CETA, Title VII), but monitored by MOET. It

consisted of recruiting 20 CETA-eligible high school students from two area high schools, negotiating agreements with five small business employers to pay minimum wage to participants for four-month internships, and providing a program of career counseling and tutoring prior to and during the internship. Students had been recruited for the project and had started the career counseling stage and tutorial stage, but they had not been placed in internships at the time of our interviews. The stated objectives of the project emphasized its utility as a model for adoption by other organizations. The unsubsidized work feature of the project as well as the collaborative relationship with the high schools were considered to be especially important attributes of the project. PACT's emphasis in other youth projects on college preparation for minority youth was carried over to the internship program; about half the participants had applied to college at the time of our interviews.

San Francisco Unified School District administered an in-school work experience program funded largely by a MOET CETA grant and partly by federal vocational educational funds. The program involved ten hours per week of fully subsidized work at minimum wage rates, with limited workplace counseling by employers and limited career orientation in the student's home school. Two central administrators handled all routine student and employer contacts as well as student payroll. In the 1980-81 school year, the program was funded at about $900,000 and enrolled 840 CETA-eligible high school youth from all the city's high schools and alternative programs. In the 1981-82 school year the program's funding was reduced to $225,000 and participation was reduced to 190 students. The funding decision, according to school district personnel, was partly based on MOET's rationale that, with reductions in federal support, work experience programs should de-emphasized in favor of programs promising

direct job placement; many school district people felt that the decision also reflected long-standing competition between the community-based organizations and the school system. In explaining the functioning of the Youth Work Program, district personnel emphasized that, in addition to the work experience students gained through the program, each high school provided additional career education and counseling. In the high schools we visited, there were career education and counseling programs, and the people running these programs did have contact with the two administrators of the Youth Work Program and some of its students; but the career education and counseling activities of the high schools were viewed both by students and administrators as separate from the CETA-funded activities.

This selection of organizations constitutes a fair cross-section of 17 or so federally-funded youth employment programs in San Fancisco. The major divisions are between those emphasising in-school youth and those working with out-of-school youth. The former predominate. The organizations also vary by the basis of their funding. Organizations like OBECA/Arriba Juntos, which have existed on federal employment training grants since the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) in the late-1950s, are likely to feel reductions in federal funding more seriously than organizations like the Buchanan YMCA, the Chinatown Youth Center, the school system, and PACT, which have spread their funding across a number of sources and can subsidize one portion of their operation with funds from another. Finally, the mix of organizations represents the tensions between those that have a community base-- Chinatown Youth Center, OBECA/Arriba Juntos, and the Buchanan YMCA, for example-- and those that deal with city-wide populations-- the school system and Youth for Service, for example. Those with a community base seemed uniformly to think that MOET and the Employment and Training Council were fair in their funding decisions; those with city-wide constituencies seemed to feel

that they were not well-represented in the funding process. The mix of organizations also accurately represents the problems of a system in transition from programs designed to provide guidance, assistance and supervision for young people in their entry to the labor to a system designed to place young people in jobs. At the time of our interviews, the signals from MOET were clear that work experience and career counseling programs were of lower priority than training and job placement programs. Most of those running work experience programs were aware that the rules of the game were shifting and, despite their reservations about the shift in many cases, foresaw shifts away from subsidized work to unsubsidized work and away from general career counseling to training and placement. Still, the mix of services was heavily oriented toward work experience and career counseling.

2. Delivery-Level Perceptions, Problems, and Working Relations

Delivery-level personnel in the organizations we studied were, with few exceptions, in their middle- to late-twenties, college-educated (bachelors or associate degrees), experienced in counseling or related work (more than two years experience in one or more jobs), and heavily committed to work with young people. The exceptions to the age and experience patterns were older school system personnel, who came to their jobs from experience in vocational education, and younger people who were products of programs like the ones they were working in.

Two dominant themes emerged when these people were asked to describe the content and purposes of their work. One theme was their role as a bridge to the labor market for young people who might not otherwise find employment. The other theme was their role as adult figures in the lives of young people for whom adults-- teachers, parents, employers-- had not been a strong influence. On the first theme, the typical description of delivery-level work

was providing the motivation, self-confidence, and basic skills necessary to prepare young people to face potential employers and make a convincing case that they should be hired. Often, this purpose was stated with a hard-headed realism. "Our job is not to be surrogate parents or welfare case workers," one common refrain ran, "but to get kids ready for work in a short period of time." The second theme diverged considerably from the first. Delivery-level work, in this perspective, consisted of taking young people with low self-esteem, a passive or hostile view of the larger world, low academic skills, and limited experience dealing with adults and giving them self-confidence, a positive self-image, and sufficient cognitive and social skills to cope in the adult world. This work usually required talking with young people at length about personal, family, and academic problems, as well as working on more formal skills. These two views were often held by the same person, with no apparent sense of contradiction. One first-level supervisor with extensive experience captured the connection between the two views by saying, "You have to love these people ruthlessly, get behind their defenses, and stay with them until you convince them that you care enough to help them."

Asked to characterize the problems presented to them by the young people they worked with, workers varied considerably in their responses. One dimension of variation was on the theme of family support. A majority of the front-line workers we interviewed cited unstable family life, weak family support, and strong peer pressure to leave school, use drugs, and commit crime as the most significant characteristic of the young people they worked with. One worker characterized the problem by saying, "I don't think people in mainstream society fully understand what crime is to these kids; it's just a reality, an alternative way of life, a way to make it on your own when no one is particularly concerned about who you are or what you're doing." But a

significant minority-- one-quarter to one-third-- of front-line workers saw the main problem less as a lack of family support and more as economic hardship. Even with family support, they argued, the adults in the lives of their clients were so preoccupied with their own economic survival that they didn't have either the time or the resources to help their children make progress. This theme was most common among adults working with in-school youth and youth from families of recent immigrants. Often, especially among Asian immigrants, but not limited to them, front-line workers said that young people came to them with significant family support but that family members often did not speak English, were themselves dependent on the social welfare system, and did not have the knowledge necessary to help their children.

Another dimension of variability was young peoples' readiness to assume responsibility for school and for work. Most delivery-level workers clearly distinguished those young people ready to assume responsibility from those who were, for one reason or another, unwilling or unable to do so. Students who were ready to assume responsibility for developing skills and seeking work, regardless of their prior problems, were seen by workers as highly desirable clients. Students who were not ready to assume responsibility were seen as difficult and risky clients. "Some of our kids feel they can achieve. Some have the 'CETA mentality'-- collect the money, expect to be spoon-fed, move from program to program without ever making it." The distinction between clients who were willing to assume responsibility for their actions and those who weren't seemed to have relatively little to do with age, ethnic group, or family background. A few workers observed that younger people-- 15-16 years old-- had greater difficulty assuming responsibility, hence were more appropriately placed in summer employment. Other workers observed that young people living outside families assumed responsibility more readily than those still living at home. On the whole, though, willingness to assume

responsibility was perceived to be independent of the client's background.

Front-line workers saw these attributes of young people as significantly affecting their jobs. Their ability to attract young people to programs and to affect young peoples' chances in the labor market depended, many argued, on young peoples' expectations, their family circumstances, the attractiveness of street life or illegal activity, and their willingness to assume responsibility. Workers saw themselves as exercising limited influence on these factors. They had access to young people for a relatively short period of time and were working against forces far more powerful than the benefits they could confer.

Most delivery-level personnel saw significant changes occurring in their work as a result of reduced federal funding and increased unemployment. Some welcomed the shift to greater emphasis on job-placements as a result of tighter funding. "The programs of the 1960s were pay-offs to maintain the peace in cities," said one experienced worker, "but now the feds want demonstrated performance. The biggest change I have seen recently is in the kids' understanding that this is not a hand-out, but more like a scholarship which offers them an opportunity to perform." Many front-line workers mentioned that during their tenure they had seen youth employment activities transformed from "income support" programs to "job placement" programs; most found this shift to be laudable. But the increased emphasis on job placements and the relatively short amount of time available to produce results, led many to express doubts about the longer-term benefits of the programs for young people. These doubts took two forms. The first was doubts about the appropriateness of employment as a measure of effectiveness. "When kids come to you with substantial language deficits, fifth-grade-or-below reading skills, and no self-esteem, it's hard to say after you've worked with them for

three weeks, or even three months, that employment is the appropriate solution to their problems," said one worker. The second doubt was about the availability of jobs, even for highly-motivated youth. "We used to place a large number of our kids with links in the paperwork and processing departments;" said one worker with out-of-school youth, "now those jobs are being taken by people with BAs who can't find other employment." Virtually all the delivery-level workers we interviewed expressed positive opinions about the emphasis on peformance brought about by decreased funding, but an equally large number seemed to feel that job placements were, by themselves, not an adequate measure of workers' performance.

Among the delivery-level workers we interviewed were a significant number, as many a one-quarter, who were actively seeking work outside the youth employment field. The most common explanations were burn-out and economic insecurity. They felt that their enthusiasm and effectiveness were waning from the pressure of the work and the lack of stability in employment from one year to the next. But this explanation was also accompanied in most cases by a pragmatic and discouraged assessment of the prospects for future employment working with high-risk youth. Most saw funding cuts as a signal that government and the public at large did not care about the problems of high-risk youth, and that their future employment was unrelated to how well they performed their jobs. Most intended to look for employment outside the field of youth work and social services, some were actively looking in the private sector.

Delivery-level workers saw themselves as exercising very little control over the selection of their clients or the determination of their case loads. The "intake function"-- accepting applications, determining income eligibility, and selecting participants-- seemed in all organizations except one to be a largely clerical function separate from the work of counselors and

teachers. In the one exception, the Chinatown Youth Center, counselors played a direct role in selection. Most front-line workers described the selection of clients as a very routinized process. The number of clients was established by the terms of the organization's contract with either MOET or the state CETA office-- a certain number of "slots" with a certain number of dollars attached to each slot. Organizations would accept applications on a continuing basis, filling vacant positions with new entrants as clients successfully completed or dropped out of the program. The major sources of clients were, in rough order of importance, word-or-mouth referrals from former clients or adults familiar with the program, recruitment by the organizations themselves, referrals from other organizations, and referrals from the centralized intake facility run by the California Employment Development Department under contract with MOET. All applications eventually were routed through the central intake facility for verification of eligibility and creation of client records as part of the MOET management information system, which tracked the progress of each client in each organization. The community organizations saw the major source of their clients being off-the-street applications, their own recruitment, and referral from other community organizations. The school system program got most of its applications from advertising in high schools and from referrals by counselors and career education coordinators in high schools.

After applications were screened and clients were accepted, the establishment of caseloads usually took a simple, pragmatic form. The number of clients was simply divided up, usually by a random process, among the front-line workers. Caseloads varied from a low of 12 to a high of 110, with the median around 25. The low end was accounted for by the PACT project, which was a demonstration project and was therefore probably deliberately kept

at a low client-worker ratio. The high end was accounted for by the school system's program, which had been characterized by caseloads as high as 420 clients per worker in earlier years. This ratio was, as far as we could determine, the result of a conscious choice on the part of the school system to run its project as a low-overhead work experience program with virtually no counseling or special educational assistance. When the extreme high and low ends of the distribution are eliminated, the remaining organizations fall in the 20-35 range. The front-line workers in these organizations seemed to think this was a reasonable workload. There were no strong complaints.

Client demand varied considerably from one organization to another. Two organizations in our sample-- Youth for Service and OBECA/Arriba Juntos-- were experiencing significant declines in demand at the time of our interviews. These organizations had relied heavily on word-of-mouth and their own recruitment for clients, and workers were not sure why there had been a decline. Two tentative explanations were advanced by front-line workers and administrators. One was that "the word is out on the street that CETA is dead, and many kids just assume there is no place for them here." The other explanation was more ominous. "Most of the kids who would have been our toughest clients in the past have opted for the street. They have long-ago decided school is a waste of time. They seem to have decided now that there is not much use trying to get a job. There are plenty of opportunities for them on the street-- drugs, prostitution, petty theft. We're not competing." One paradoxical effect of the drop in demand was a general rise in the motivation that front-line workers observed in those who did enter their programs. "Some kids, especially the asians, come in here and say, 'I'll participate for free [without a stipend],'" said one worker. Another observed, "We've got an increasing number of tough, highly-motivated kids-- many of them living on their own, some living in their cars." One delivery-

level worker captured the frustration expressed by many when he said, "The kids are out there. In fact, they're out there in increasingly large numbers. All you have to do is look out the window or walk down the street and you see them. If we don't get them, they are going to be living off society one way or another-- welfare or crime."

Only one organization in our sample-- Chinatown Youth Center-- had to cope explicitly with excess demand. They initially received 200 applications for 35 positions. The screened the applications down to 60, giving preference to older clients (17-18) because, in the words of one frontline worker, "they needed the experience more and would be easier to place in jobs." After the first screening, applicants were interviewed by two staff members and the final 35 were chosen. At this stage, priority was given to young people who had had problems with the law enforcement system, on the rationale that they would benefit more from work and that this clientele was consistent with the Center's other activities.

The school system reduced its caseload substantially, from 840 to 190 clients, but seemed to do so simply by taking applications on a first-come, first-served basis (subject to eligibility requirements). There was no evidence, in our interviews or in our observations of activities in high schools, that the Youth Work Program had explicitly dealt with excess demand.

Overall, the evidence on client demand, recruitment, screening, and selection in San Francisco supports a view that front-line workers and administrators exercise very little direct control over who their clients are, how many clients they serve, and the level of demand for their services. Numbers of clients and caseloads are largely determined through the availability of funding from MCET and contractural arrangements, not by direct measures of the number of youth to be served in a given area. All

organizations engaged in some level of recruitment, but most recruitment efforts were either informal contacts in the immediate community or public service announcements on local media. There was little systematic thought about marketing or deliberate strategies for increasing demand, probably because there was no incentive to do so in a system where "slots" were allocated centrally. Furthermore, front-line workers and administrators in community organizations seemed unable to explain variations in demand, except by conjecture. They saw themselves, in large part, as responding to forces in the community and the economy over which they exercised little or no influence.

The routine work of front-line workers showed little variation from one organization to another. There were four basic delivery-level tasks present in all organizations: job development, counseling, teaching, and visiting employers.

Job development was an episodic, non-routine task. A large amount of effort was required early in a program's history, whenever there were increases in enrollment, or decreases in participating employers, to find employers willing to take young people on a subsidized or unsubsidized basis. Once these contacts were made, however, they provided a pool of contacts to whom future clients could be referred, so that development of new jobs did not seem to consume a large share of delivery-level resources in programs that had been underway for awhile. Subsidized jobs, with the exception of on-the-job training (OJT) for a select few job-ready clients, are all in public agencies or non-profit private agencies. This constraint was imposed by federal regulation to prevent the use of federal funds from undercutting the wages of unsubsidized workers in private firms. Front-line workers could develop jobs for their clients in the private sector as long as the jobs were not subsidized, which meant that the employer's incentive to hire clients was

diminished. All the organizations in our sample, except the school system's Youth Work Program, had some experience with profit-making firms as well as non-profit organizations, though the bulk of their youth placements had been in non-profit organizations. One project, PACT, was designed completely around unsubsidized private sector jobs.

Job development requires selling both the client and the organization to the potential employer. Some organizations put more stress on qualities of the program. One administrator of an out-of-school program with a heavy emphasis on preparing students to pass the high school equivalency exam said, for example, "we approach employers by saying, 'if you hire a product of the high school system, you have no idea what you're actually getting, but if you hire one of our products, we can tell you exactly what they know." Others stressed attributes of the clients, like their need for financial support and their motivation to work. Most front-line workers thought they could place clients in unsubsidized jobs in profit-making firms and saw that as an important new market for their organizations.

There was little or no visible competition among community organizations in job development, but neither was there much sign of cooperation. With the exception of the school system, most organizations saw their immediate community as their "turf"-- a stable market from which to draw the major share of their placements. Turf boundaries, however, seemed to be vaguely defined, so that there were large areas of the city and large numbers of non-profit organizations-- hospitals, government offices, social service agencies-- that were open to everyone. A similar situation seemed to hold in the central business district of the city, where individual organizations established employer-by-employer relationships, and no one seemed to regard the area as its exclusive turf.

Matching individuals with jobs-- for work experience or on-the-job training-- was seen by most front-line workers as an important, highly judgemental task. One person with a lot of experience suggested that, "there is a big difference between young people and older unemployed adults. We can place younger people very successfully downtown, and they do quite well. But many of our adults have to be placed in small neighborhood firms in order to do well." Another worker saw the matching process as one of communicating clearly to the client that he or she bore the major responsibility for making the placement work. "Until they're ready to understand that their job performance reflects on them, and on us, we can't afford to try and place them."

The counseling and teaching functions were closely related, but quite distinct. Programs that dealt mainly with in-school youth focused most of their educational efforts on periodic workshops for career development-- resume-writing, personal appearance, self-image, interviewing skills, occupational choice, and the like. These educational efforts were clearly seen by front-line workers as supplementing the students' school and home life, making them familiar with aspects of the outside world that they were not assured of learning about at home or in school. Programs that dealt mainly with out-of-school youth focused their educational efforts on both remedial skill training and career development. Both the organizations in our sample that dealt with out-of-school youth-- Youth for Service and OBECA/Arriba Juntos-- had strong basic education components staffed by people who saw their main job as teaching, rather than counseling or job placement. These people tended to be experienced in other settings with similar clients, to manifest a fierce commitment to their work, and to be very critical of what they perceived to be the shortcomings of the public school system. They saw themselves as making up for the failure of the public school system to serve

its toughest clientele. The also saw themselves as working under very clear performance standards. As one teacher said, "I know how well I'm doing by how many people pass the GED."

Counseling was seen as the softer side of education-- informal, one-on-one or small-group discussions, often spanning personal problems and academic problems as well as problems having to do with work or career choice. All the front-line workers we interviewed mentioned that they spent a substantial fraction of their time from 50% to 80% of their time dealing directly with clients individually or in small groups. Even those who took a primarily instrumental view of their jobs-- defined as securing work for their clients-- said they spent a certain amount of time talking about their clients' personal problems. Those who took a broader view of their jobs stressed the interconnectedness of personal and employment problems, saying they often interceded on behalf of their clients with other social service agencies or provided help with family problems. Many cited their most important function as being available to young people when they needed assistance. The product of counseling was seen as much more difficult to define than education but the activity was seen as being very important.

All organizations had some system for soliciting employers' opinions and monitoring clients' performance at the work site. In the majority of the cases, these consisted of regular informal visits to employers and detailed records of whether young people were at work when they were supposed to be. The typical front-line worker might visit 12-15 work sites over a period of three or four months and then begin the process again. Detailed records of young peoples' attendance were necessary, in subsidized work programs, to establish the basis for earnings. These work records were typically kept by the young person and the front-line worker, submitted to the employer once a

month for verification, and then submitted to the organization to be processed as part the payroll. Most of the complaints that front-line workers had about paperwork could be traced to the system of monitoring attendance and performance on the job.

With the exception of the school system's program, all organizations seemed to have relatively flexible internal structures and relatively informal processes for evaluating workers' performance. The nature of the school systems' program was probably dictated by the fact that two front-line workers were responsible for about 200 clients during the time of our study and as many as 340 in previous years. This meant that their work consisted largely of processing payroll claims, sending standardized evaluation forms to employers, visiting high schools, and, when time permitted, visiting employers. Their performance in these tasks was evaluated by their immediate superior according to established school district procedures, and involved little or no informal consultation. All the other organizations had much more informal working relations and evaluation processes. About two-thirds of those interviewed said their performance had been evaluated, but the method of evaluation varied from informal consultations with their immediate superior, which was the dominant mode, to formal assessments, which occurred in only a few cases. Virtually everyone in community organizations said they met with their peers in a group at least once a week to discuss common problems. Almost everyone said that, if they had a problem requiring an administrative decisions, their immediate supervisor could resolve it.

The boundary between supervisors and front-line workers was very ill-defined in all the community organizations. Virtually all first-line supervisors had come from the ranks, and were distinguished by the fact that they had slightly more experience and, in some cases, more formal education than the people they supervised. Experience, more than education, was the key

variable separating workers from supervisors. Supervisors had a high degree of identification with clients and workers and often spent a large fraction of their time essentially doing what front-line workers did. Relations between front-line workers and their supervisors were informal and collegial.

Authority relations between the "bottom" and the "top" of the community organizations are more difficult to specify. In virtually all cases, workers and their supervisors saw themselves as being in control of the day-to-day decisions involved in their work-- job development, counseling, education, and relations with employers. The higher levels of the organization were looked upon as being responsible for developing new funding opportunities and dealing with the political dimension of relations with funding agencies. In some of the small-scale organizations-- the Buchanan Y and the Chinatown Youth Center, for example-- there was little formal distinction between top and bottom. Instead, there was a single person who assumed responsibility for outside relations in addition to other duties. In larger-scale organizations-- OBECA/Arriba Juntos and Youth for Service-- there was a more formally-defined organizational structure and one or more people who focused mainly on outside relations. In all instances, community organizations seemed to manage themselves with considerable flexibility and informality. In fact, one front-line worker thought the process was much too informal. "The one thing we don't learn on our jobs is how to manage; we need more attention to administrative skills; we don't spend time working on them and we don't have the opportunity to pursue training in them on the outside."

Asked to specify how policies, rules, and procedures affected their jobs, front-line workers stressed two themes. The first was that their main familiarity with "policy" came in the form of restrictions on whom they could serve and the conditions under which they could be placed in employment.

These restrictions were perceived to have an important effect on their jobs, and to place unreasonable demands on workers at times, but they were not perceived to be disruptive. Most complaints came in the form of suggestions that often clients who don't meet the income eligibility guidelines are more needy and more motivated than those who do or that performance standards that stress job placement are unreasonable when clients may need more remedial help or further counseling to succeed beyond the end of the program. The second theme was that the project mode of funding-- whereby organizations are funded by the state CETA office or MOET to run a specific progject for a specific client population over a specific period of time-- creates inflexibilities within an organization. Front-line workers tended to see the needs of their clients in terms of the total array of services the organization could offer, rather than the specific program in which the client was enrolled. They often saw internal project boundaries as unreasonable constraints on their work. But in all organizations they developed ways of moving clients from one program to another and finding opportunities in other programs-- vocational training, for example-- that would work for specific clients.

There was, for all practical purposes, no contact between front-line workers in different organizations working with similar populations of young people. Asked to give examples of contacts with people from other organizations, the main example, usually coming from administrators rather than front-line workers, was the youth subcommittee of the MOET Employment and Training Council, where important questions about the distribution of funds were decided. Other than this, people could cite no examples of regular working relationships with others in similar organizations having to do with client referrals, recruitment of employers, and practical problems of mutual interest.

The picture of delivery-level practice and working conditions that

emerges from our interviews in San Francisco, then, is characterized by (1) limited or non-existent control over the number and type of clients served; (2) common functions pursued in a wide variety of mainly community-based organizational settings; (3) informal structures and processes for supervision and evaluation, both of front-line workers and cients; (4) a high level of individual discretion and control in the performance on day-to-day tasks; (5) attention directed inward to peers and clients, rather than outward to other organizations dealing with similar problems; and (6) a project structure within organizations that front-line workers regarded as introducing inflexibilities into their work.

3. Young Peoples' Perceptions and Experiences

The 30 young people we interviewed were selected on a random basis from youth who happened to be at the site when we were there; there is no reason to expect that they are not a representative cross-section. All respondents were low-income, under the that definition governs CETA eligibility. About half the respondents were between the ages of 16 and 18, and about half between 19 and 21. With few exceptions, the older participants were enrolled in out-of-school programs, while the younger were enrolled in in-school programs; only two respondents in the 19-21 bracket were enrolled full-time in high school and they were both recent immigrants from Asia. All the respondents were living with family members; no respondents were living on their own. Slightly less than half were living with two parents, about one-quarter were living with single parents, and the rest were living with brothers, sisters, or spouses.

The proportion of those attending high school and those not was a function of the programs in which we interviewed; about two-thirds were currently attending high school, about one-third had left school without

completing, most of them after the tenth or eleventh grade. None of the school-leavers gave economic necessity as their reason for leaving; most expressed dissatisfaction with the way they were treated in school and boredom with school as their major reason for leaving. A typical comment was, "it was very boring; when I finished my work, there was nothing else to do but sit there, and no one seemed to care whether I was there or not."

More than half the respondents said their educational plans included post-secondary or college education. Only one respondent said unequivocally that he wanted no education beyond high school; the remainder were unclear. Virtually all had taken at least one vocational or career education course in high school; three people had taken two or more of such courses. The majority of vocational courses were typing or clerical courses, a few had taken electronics-related courses, and a few had taken career orientation courses. In only a handful of cases (two or three), did young people state a career preference related to vocational courses they had taken in high school.

All respondents had work experience. Half had had two or three jobs, two respondents had had four or more jobs, and the remainder had had one job. The fact that most youth we interviewed had had more than two jobs suggests that they were active in the labor market independently of the programs in which they were currently enrolled, all of which involved work experience of one kind or another. Asked to give examples of adults who had been helpful to them in securing work, the majority identified people who were directly involved in CETA-funded programs (counselors, job developers, administrators), about one-quarter identified family members, and about one-quarter said they could identify no helpful adults. School personnel, other than those involved in CETA-funded activities, were notably absent from young peoples' descriptions of helpful adults. Three young people identified school

personnel as having helped them find work, but in all three cases these adults could be traced to CETA-funded activities. Generally speaking, the young people we interviewed did not see school personnel as playing an important role in their career decisions.

Asked whether their two closest friends were working, the vast majority of the repondents said yes; in less than one-quarter of the cases did young people say that a friend was not working. The same pattern held when young people were asked whether their friends liked working; the vast majority said yes, only a small number said no.

We asked a series of attitudinal questions about work and school. Asked to respond to the statement that "most adults I have known in school care about whether I succeed or fail," responses were equally divided between those who agreed and disagreed. School personnel were not perceived as caring a great deal. The vast majority of young people interviewed agreed with the statement that their performance in school was important in determining how well they would do later in life; there were no differences between in-school and out-of-school youth in this area. There was also predominant agreement that how well you do in school depends on how hard you try. When asked to respond to the statement, "The longer you stay in school, the more money you will make," about half agreed and about half disagreed. This pattern of responses suggests that young people see school performance as playing an important role in later success, but see school people as not being very helpful and do not see a clear relationship between time spent in school and earnings.

Asked to respond to the statement that the main reason for working was to earn money, about three-quarters agreed. The same pattern of responses occurred when young people were asked whether doing good work would make a difference in their ability to get better jobs. Asked to respond to the

statement, "If you lose a job, it's your own fault," more than half the respondents disagreed, citing economic reasons, legitimate disagreements with supervisors, and unfair treatment as major reasons why one might lose a job. Virtually all respondents said they thought it was important to be happy about one's work and that work would be an important part of their lives. However, when they were asked to respond to the statement, "Most people I know like to work," only about half agreed and half disagreed. These reponses confirm what most attitudinal studies of young people show: that young people have a very positive attitude toward work and a generally optimistic view of the role that work will play in their lives. They also suggest that young people make distinctions between unemployment caused by poor performance and that caused by conditions beyond their control and between their own hopes and other peoples' experiences with work.

Our interviews suggest that there is no simple set of attributes that characterizes "high-risk" youth. All the young people in our sample could be said to have a greater-than-average chance of being unemployed, or of being in and out of the labor market with greater-than-average frequency, since they come from predominantly low-income families and are predominantly from ethnic and liguistic minorities. But they all demonstrated a very high level of attachment to the labor market, both in terms of their behavior and their attitudes. They wanted to work, they liked work, and they wanted to achieve in both school and work. Insofar as we think "high-risk" youth as apathetic, alienated, or disengaged from society, this characterization doesn't apply to our sample. Young people who meet that description probably exist. Indeed, front-line workers in the organizations where we interviewed suggested that large numbers of such youth are on the streets. But the young people who are in the programs we studied, by and large, manifest very positive, mainstream

attitudes toward school and work.

A large proportion of the out-of-school youth we interviewed were recent converts to this positive view. They were, in a majority of cases, careful to distinguish in our interviews between the attitudes they held toward school and work before they entered their current programs and those they held after they had entered the program. A typical statement was, "I didn't understand how much school mattered until I started working with Mr. or Mrs. 'X' [usually a counselor in the program where the youth was currently enrolled], then I figured out why it was important." Statements of this kind, which are typical of our interviews with out-of-school youth, also illustrate another important facet of young peoples' view of school and work. It is a highly individualized view. They see the world, by and large, as being composed of individuals-- counselors, family members, friends, employers-- who have or have not been helpful to them. Their world is not composed of "structures," "organizations," or "processes;" it is world composed of individual people. Consequently, many of their descriptions of their experiences relate to significant individuals and the role those people played in their lives. "The thing about this program that I didn't see in high school," one typical remark ran, "is that they care about whether you're doing the work and they get after you if you're not. People in this place care a lot."

A corollary of this view is that most out-of-school youth had nothing good to say about their experience in high school. One young person said, for example, "I was a 'B' student before I got to high school, but when I got there it was big and impersonal, no one knew me, and no one seemed to care whether I was there or not. So I cut classes a lot. Here, in my GED class, Mr. 'X' has patience, he listens to questions, and he goes through the subjects in a step-by-step process until each of us knows it." The most common theme in our interviews with out-of-school youth was the anonymity,

impersonality, and lack of individual attention that characterized their high school experience. This pattern was confirmed by the absence of school personnel among the adults that young people said had helped them find jobs.

A substantial proportion of the youth we interviewed-- as many as one-third to one-half-- had been enrolled in other federally-supported work activities before they came to the one in which they were presently enrolled. Many of the in-school youth had gotten into their current program by virtue of having participated in a summer employment program. Many youth, in-school and out-of-school, had participated in employment training, work experience, or career education programs in other organizations before coming to the one they were currently enrolled in. The connections between these various programs seemed to be individual and spontaneous, rather than structured and institutional. Young people mentioned relatives, usually brothers and sisters, or friends as their major source of information about what programs were available. No one we interviewed said they had gone to a central referral point, like the intake office of MOET, to find out about available programs.

The profile of young people that emerges from our interviews is generally consistent with other empirical data on youth participation in school and work. Young people were extraordinarily active labor market participants, the majority having had two or more jobs by the time we interviewed them. They were positively oriented toward both education and work, attaching importance both to their performance in school and to their performance on the job. They negotiated their relationships with training, work experience, and education largely through networks of individuals-- significant adults in employment and training organizations, friends, and relatives. And they had high

aspirations, the majority having plans for post-secondary education at some point in their lives, though these plans were not always consistent with their performance in school to that point.

4. Conclusion

San Francisco combines relatively strong central administration with a very decentralized system of delivery based on community organizations. Central administration meant, operationally, that decisions about the mix of programs (work experience, on-the-job training, classroom training, remedial education) and the mix of clients were made by the MOET staff and the Employment and Training Council. Also, performance expectations were communicated to contractors on the expectation that their performance would affect future funding. Decentralized delivery meant that community organizations, once their proposals to MOET were funded, exercised broad discretion in the type of clients they served (subject to eligibility constraints), the details of program design, and the "markets" they constructed for job placements. There were no explicit constraints on where organizations could recruit clients or employers. But an implicit system had evolved, in which organizations specialized in particular client groups, by ethnicity and school status, and developed networks of employers to serve as job sites for their clients. There was no evidence in our interviews of overt competition among community organizations for either clients or employers. Furthermore, when MOET guidelines required organizations to recruit a cross-section of clients from all ethnic groups, the organizations effectively ignored the requirement and continued to specialized by neighborhood and ethnic group.

Delivery-level workers in community organizations did not see themselves as exercising decisive control over recruitment and admission of clients to

programs On the contrary, they saw demand as being determined largely by two factors outside their control: the willingness of young people to enter the program and quotas on the number of participants ("slots") given by MOET. The organizations we studied did not seem to confront problems of excess demand. Once the number of clients was set, workloads and responsibilities were typically settled in straightforward ways-- by random allocation of clients, by informal working agreements on who would do what, and by mutual adjustment among colleagues. The dominant management style within community organizations was informal and collegial. The school system's style of management was formal and routinized, stemming from a conscious choice to run its program as a high-volume, low-interaction enterprise designed to give the maximum number of students work experience.

Front-line workers viewed the purpose of their work in two ways: personal counseling and employment. While different workers tended to characterize their views as predominantly one or the other, most workers gave attention to both, and did not perceive the purposes as necessarily contradictory. The most serious source of disagreement between front-line workers and central administrators was on the issue of the appropriateness of job placement as a criterion for success of youth employment programs. The workers tended to argue from individual cases, saying that the appropriateness of job placement depended on the nature of the clients. The central administrators tended to see success as an aggregate problem of demonstrating performance. Workers did not demonstrate great difficulty adapting to increased expectations for job placement.

The young people in our sample were active labor market participants with relatively well-developed sets of individual contacts-- family, employment counselors, and friends-- who could help them find work. They did not see schools as performing a major role in their entry to the labor force. They

saw the adults in the programs they were participating in as the major factor in helping them find jobs.